

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXX.

BALTIMORE, APRIL, 1915.

No. 4.

## CHAUCER AND THE LITURGY

Chaucer appropriately concludes his characterization of the gentle Pardoner with certain observations concerning his liturgical accomplishments:

But trewely to tellen atte laste,  
He was in chirche a noble ecclesiaste;  
Wel koude he rede a lessoun or a storie,<sup>1</sup>  
But alderbest he song an offertorie.<sup>2</sup>

It is obvious that these lines contain, in vernacular form, two technical terms from the Roman liturgy: *lessoun*, for the *lectio* of the Canonical Office; and *offertorie*, for the *offertorium* of the Mass. Students of Chaucer, however, appear not to have observed in this passage a third term from liturgiology in the word *storie*.

Many editors omit the word *storie* from notes and glossary, on the assumption, we may fairly infer, that the word is to be interpreted in its general modern sense.<sup>3</sup> Other editors provide such glosses as the following: "history, legend of a saint (or the like)";<sup>4</sup> "a saint's life or *exemplum*, a moral anecdote";<sup>5</sup> "the 'gospel' for a given day in the Church service; or perhaps the 'legend of a saint'";<sup>6</sup> "légende";<sup>7</sup>

"history, story";<sup>8</sup> "legend."<sup>9</sup> No editor, so far as I know, has explicitly identified *storie* with the technical term *historia* of liturgiology.

The exact sense of the term may be most readily understood if we consider first the precise meaning and liturgical associations of the word *lessoun* (*lectio*). The liturgical *lectiones* are found in Matins, the first of the eight ecclesiastical offices that constitute collectively the Canonical Office. The chief content of Matins is a series of psalms, each provided with an antiphon, and a series of *lectiones*, each followed by a responsory (*responsorium*). These liturgical elements are grouped in units called Nocturns (*Nocturni*), Matins containing one Nocturn or three according to the ferial or festal nature of the day. The structure of the Nocturn may be outlined thus:<sup>10</sup>

NOCTURNUS  
Antiphona  
Psalmus  
Antiphona  
Psalmus  
Antiphona  
Psalmus  
Lectio  
Responsorium  
Lectio  
Responsorium  
Lectio  
Responsorium

With this scheme before us we may readily appraise the following precise meanings given in liturgiology to the term *historia*:

(1) A series of *lectiones* covering a book of the Bible, or a story in the Bible, or the *vita* (*passio, legenda*) of a saint, the series of *lec-*

<sup>1</sup> Mss. Cambridge, Corpus, Lansdowne: *story*.  
<sup>2</sup> *Canterbury Tales*, ll. 707-710 (MS. Ellesmere).

<sup>3</sup> T. Speght, *The Works of . . . Chaucer*, London, 1587; T. Tyrwhitt, *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer*, 2 Vols., Oxford, 1798; A. W. Pollard, *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, 2 Vols., London, 1894; *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Globe Edition), London, 1906; M. H. Liddell, *Chaucer: The Prologue, etc.*, New York, 1907; H. N. MacCracken, *The College Chaucer*, New Haven, 1913; E. A. Greenlaw, *Selections from Chaucer* (Lake English Classics).

<sup>4</sup> W. W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Vol. VI, Oxford, 1894, p. 248.

<sup>5</sup> F. J. Mather, *The Prologue, etc.* (Riverside Literature Series), Boston, 1899, Glossary, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> H. B. Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, Northampton, 1907, p. 46.

<sup>7</sup> French translation by M. Cazamian in *Les Contes de Canterbury*, Paris, 1908, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup> O. F. Emerson, *Poems of Chaucer*, New York, 1911, p. 245.  
<sup>9</sup> Translation into modern English by J. S. P. Tatlock and P. MacKaye in *The Modern Reader's Chaucer*, New York, 1912, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> In regard to the structure of Matins see, for example, V. Thalhofer and L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, Vol. II, Freiburg, 1912, pp. 574-587; S. Bäumer, *Histoire du Bréviaire*, Vol. I, Paris, 1905, pp. 354-397.

*tiones* being accompanied by appropriate musical pieces. The *historia* was usually referred to by the opening words of the *responsorium* attached to the first section of Scripture.<sup>11</sup>

In Septembre xv primis diebus de historia Job legitur, et cantatur responsorium *Si bona*. Reliquis xv diebus de historia Thobie, Judith, et Hester legitur, et canuntur de eisdem historiis, scilicet *Peto domine*, *Adonai*, et *Dominator domine*.<sup>12</sup>

Sequitur de temporali quod accidit ab octavis Trinitatis usque ad Adventum Domini, et continet in se multas hystorias, primo hystoriam Librorum Regum cum hoc responsorio *Deus omnium*.<sup>13</sup>

Dominica IIIa post Pascha et per totam septimanam legitur et cantatur sicut dictum est in precedenti dominica, scilicet de eisdem hystoriis.<sup>14</sup>

(2) A series of *lectiones*, without musical pieces, covering a book of the Bible, or a story in the Bible, or the *vita* (*passio*, *legenda*) of a saint.<sup>15</sup>

Septuagesima, sepcies decem, et representat tempus deviacionis, sive tempus culpe et pene; verum statim in prima dominica legitur historia libri Genesis, eo quod in eadem historia agitur de deviacione et errore primorum parentum.<sup>16</sup>

Sabbato proximo ante LXX . . . In I° et II° et III° nocturno, super psalmos solito more ex-

penduntur *Alleluia*. Historia mutatur et incipit liber Genesis; responsoria vero nequaquam mutantur.<sup>17</sup>

In octabis beati Johannis . . . responsoria de hystoria propria, scilicet primum, secundum, at nonum; lectiones ex hystoria ecclesiastica que incipiunt *Audi fabulam*.<sup>18</sup>

In numerous references it is impossible to tell whether the word belongs in the first class or the second:

[In natali Sancti Urbani]

Lectiones leguntur de historia; responsoria cantantur de responsorio *Iste sanctus*.<sup>19</sup>

Historiae et caetera, quae in Ecclesia leguntur, non debent legi in Refectorio, donec in Ecclesia incipiantur.<sup>20</sup>

Lectiones leguntur in hystoria de epistolis beati Pauli; responsoria de responsorio *Absterget*.<sup>21</sup>

(3) A series of *responsoria* taken from one book of the Bible.<sup>22</sup>

Concinit chorus in sedendo hystoriam *In monte Oliveto*, donec omnia altaris laventur.<sup>23</sup>

Nota quod in ista Dominica cantatur Istoria *Dignus es Domine*, etc., quae Istoria cantatur per duas Dominicas.<sup>24</sup>

Prima die octabarum legitur sermo beati Maximi

<sup>11</sup> C. Wordsworth and H. Littlehales, *The Old Service-Books of the English Church*, London, 1904, pp. 81, 132.

<sup>12</sup> Ordinarium Remense saec. xiii (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, ed. Chevalier, Vol. VII, Paris, 1900, p. 155).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, p. 235.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, p. 234.

<sup>15</sup> Wordsworth and Littlehales, pp. 81, 132. The word *history* is probably used in this technical sense in the following passages in *The Golden Legend* (*The Temple Classics*, ed. F. S. Ellis):

Here beginneth the history of Joseph and his brethren, which is read the third Sunday in Lent. (Ellis, Vol. I, p. 228.)

Here next followeth the history of Moses, which is read in the Church on Mid-lent Sunday.

(Ellis, Vol. I, p. 256.)

I am not able to quote these passages from a manuscript or an early printed edition of the *Golden Legend* in English. These passages are not found in the Wynkyn de Worde edition (1512?) in the Harvard College Library.

<sup>19</sup> Ordinarium Remense saec. xiii (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, ed. Chevalier, Vol. VII, Paris, 1900, p. 109).

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, p. 110.

<sup>18</sup> Ordinarium Baiocense saec. xiii (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, Vol. VIII, Paris, 1902, p. 77).

<sup>19</sup> Ordinarium Laudunense ann. 1173-1228 (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, ed. Chevalier, Vol. VI, Paris, 1897, p. 281).

<sup>20</sup> Du Cange, *Glossarium*, voc. *Historia*.

<sup>21</sup> Ordinarium Laudunense ann. 1173-1228 (*ed. cit.*, p. 230).

<sup>22</sup> Bäumer, Vol. II, p. 77; P. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, London, 1912, p. 81; W. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1882, p. xxvii; Amalarius Metensis, *Liber de Ordine Antiphonarii*, cap. lxii et seq. (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CV, col. 1309-1311); Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animae*, Libr. III, cap. xxix (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CLXXII, col. 650); *Ordinale Sarum* (Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. XX, London, 1901), pp. 29, 31, 33, 116, 130, 154, 157; *Fragmenta Liturgica* (Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. VII, London, 1894), pp. 119-156 *passim*.

<sup>23</sup> Consuetudinarium Baiocense saec. xv (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, ed. Chevalier, Vol. VIII, Paris, 1902, p. 388).

<sup>24</sup> Du Cange, *Glossarium*, voc. *Historia*.

episcopi qui incipit *Audistis fratres*; responsoria de hystoria diei sicut predictum est.<sup>25</sup>

(4) A rimed office for a feast, in which all, or some, of the musical pieces of the Canonical Office are versified.<sup>26</sup>

Of the four definitions given above, it appears that either the first or the second (and the two are essentially alike) is apt in the Chaucerian line before us, which may now be interpreted in some such sense as the following: "He well knew how to read a *lectio* (a single *lesson*) or a *historia* (an entire series of *lessons*)." In the irreverent spirit of the context one is even tempted to lapse into the following: "He well knew how to read either a single lesson or the whole string of lessons."

Whether or not the interpretation of *storie* as *historia* suggests a fresh gleam of Chaucerian humor, it appears to provide an additional indication of Chaucer's accurate acquaintance with the liturgiology of the Church of Rome.

KARL YOUNG.

University of Wisconsin.

#### CONCERNING CHRISTOPHER SMART

It is definitely known that Smart employed the pseudonym "Mary Midnight" as early as 1751, and it is assumed that he derived the name from Henry Fielding's *Miss Lucy in Town*; but it is hard to determine precisely how much of what appeared over this signature is really Smart's. G. J. Gray, in his article in the *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* (London, Vol. VI, pp. 269 ff.), takes up in detail the various pen-names which Smart used. In a note at the foot of page 281,

<sup>25</sup> *Ordinarium Baiocense saec. xiii* (*Bibliothèque Liturgique*, ed. Chevalier, Vol. VIII, Paris, 1902, p. 81).

<sup>26</sup> Bäumer, Vol. II, p. 77; V. Thalhofer and L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, Vol. I, Freiburg, 1912, p. 77; *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, Vol. V, Leipzig, 1886, p. 6; Wetzler and Welte, *Kirchenlexikon*, Vol. X, Freiburg, 1897, col. 968.

the writer asks for further information about *Mother Midnight's Miscellany*, 1751; Mary Midnight's *Old Woman's Dunciad*, 1751; and *Mrs. Midnight's Orations*, 1763.

As far as I can judge, the first two works are not Smart's, but the last is. In the *Midwife*, I, 144, Mary Midnight (definitely Smart in this case) denies that she is the author of "that poor paultry pamphlet" lately published in her name, and further advertises that the *Old Woman's Dunciad* is not hers. This last pamphlet came out early in 1751 (see *Whitehall Evening Post*, Jan. 3-5, 1751) shortly before Mary Midnight's warning in her *Midwife*, and is a work directed in satire against Smart, Fielding, and Hill. Obviously this can not be Smart's production. But my information concerning the "paultry pamphlet" is less conclusive. The *British Museum Catalogue*, which definitely attributes the *Old Woman's Dunciad* to William Kenrick, is nearly certain that *Mother Midnight's Miscellany* is the above "paultry pamphlet" repudiated by Mary Midnight; yet I found that this and another pamphlet bearing the title *Mother Midnight's Comical Pocket Book* are both advertised in the cover of volume one of the Bodleian copy of the *Midwife*. Both are pamphlets approximately the same in size, but the latter has nearly three times the number of pages that the former has. Of their contents I know nothing; but I judge from the title-page of the *Miscellany* that this one, at least, is hostile to Mary Midnight. It is for these reasons that I believe that this is the "paultry pamphlet" referred to in the *Midwife*.

*Mrs. Midnight's Orations*, however, is Smart's work, or at least, is representative of his work. About November 15th, 1751, the publication of the *Midwife* seems to have been suspended for a long period; for between number 2 of volume 3 and number 4 of the same volume there is an interval of over a year. This fact is commented upon by John Hill in his *Inspector* of Dec. 7, 1752, in a passage which I quote below. Just at the time when Smart was about to abandon his work in the *Midwife*, the second number of the third vol-



ume (above mentioned) records the opening of Mrs. Mary Midnight's *Oratory* and prints her "Inaugural Speech." Smart had evidently taken up the giving of public entertainments in order to gain a living; and of this fact contemporary evidence is not lacking. Hill writes in his *Inspector*, No. 544, Dec. 7, 1752, in a scurrilous attack on Smart:

"When the *Midwife* died, and from Author he commenced Orator; when he produced, under the Name of the Old Woman's Oratory, what all have declared the meanest, the most absurd, and most contemptible of all Performances that have disgraced a Theatre . . . And very lately, when he had got into the Direction of a Company of *Dogs and Monkeys*, I (altho' from the Accounts I have since received I heartily beg Pardon of the Publick for it) spoke of them as capable to afford Entertainment."

Simon Partridge (pseudonym) in his *Letter to Henry Woodward* (Dec., 1752) mentions on page eight "my good Master Smart, who makes me laugh so lustily, with his *Spoons* and his *Salt-box*, and his Regiment of *Italian Dogs*."

The precise nature of these performances, the scene of their presentation, and the period during which Smart continued to direct them, are fairly easy to determine. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Jan., 1752, p. 43, reviews the performance as a "Banter" on Henley's Oratory and a "Puff" for the *Old Woman's Magazine*. Smart, himself, in his *Midwife* of Nov., 1751, states that the purpose of the establishment is simply "to raise a Fund of rational Mirth" without blasphemy or treason, and not in opposition to the Clare-Market Orator (Henley); but I notice that some space is devoted to a take-off on Henley in Mary Midnight's review of her first performance. Among the early performers were "Signior Antonio Ambrosiano" on the violin "Cremona Staccato," and "Signior Claudio Molipitano" as a "Candle-Snuffer," who seem to have assisted Mary Midnight in her "Orations"; but who these persons were I have not been able to discover, and I am not at all sure that Smart took the part of Mary Midnight in delivering her declamations. Some further idea of the nature of these performances may be gained by perusing an advertise-

ment in the *London Daily Advertiser* of Dec. 8, 1752, which records that on the evening of that day Mrs. Midnight was to give a concert and a performance called *The Old Woman's Oratory*, at which there was to be an "Oration on the Salt-Box, by a Rationalist; the Dissertation on the Jews Harp, by a Casuist, . . . with several New Performances of a very extraordinary Nature, particularly a Piece by Sig. Spoonatissimo, on an Instrument dug out of the Ruins of Herculaneum . . . to conclude with a grand Dance in the ancient British Taste." The public evidently liked to be hoaxed in an amusing fashion, for Sig. Spoonatissimo seems to have used ordinary household spoons (see Simon Partridge's *Letter* quoted above) to amuse his audience.

These performances were held intermittently throughout the year 1752 at the New-Theatre, Haymarket, and occasionally at the Castle-Tavern, Paternoster Row. Smart advertised often in such a way as to gain notoriety, and drew down on his head several adversaries who attacked him more often anonymously. The performances began at six p. m. and must have lasted way into the wee sma' hours; the prices of admission were from five to two shillings. Of the popularity of these performances I know nothing except that they had a long run, and were repeated as late as the year 1754 (see Douce Prints, a. 49, no. 142). To vary the programme, Smart gave, in May, 1752, a performance called *Caudle* in which Mons. Timbertoe (a peg-legged dancer) was the chief attraction. The details of this can be found in the *General Advertiser* of May 22, 1752. Another special performance at the Oratory in Dec., 1752, was that of Mrs. Midnight's *Animal Comedians*—Italian dogs and monkeys, referred to above in quotations from Hill's *Inspector* and Partridge's *Letter to Henry Woodward*. Among the Douce Prints (a. 49) one finds a picture of these performing animals; and in the *Adventurer*, No. 19, I, 109 ff., one can read a satire on the performance.

Dibdin, in his *Complete History*, V, 190 (1800), states that Rolt and Smart ran this "famous amusement," and calls Smart "an-



other dissipated promoter of midnight orgies." Whether the book, *Mrs. Midnight's Orations*, London, 1763, does faithfully record the orations "as they were spoken at the Oratory in the Haymarket" I do not know; but it seems likely that Smart, who was then living, was responsible for the publication of these *Orations*.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Cornell University.

### LONGFELLOW'S POEMS ON SLAVERY IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO FREILIGRATH

When Longfellow went to Europe for the third time, he went, in the first place, to regain his failing health at the baths in the Schmitz Institution at Marienberg, near Boppard, on the Rhine. He met a poet friend and Maecenas, the Landrat Karl Heuberger, from St. Goar, who introduced him to Ferdinand Freiligrath, which led to an intimate and lifelong friendship. Both poets, already well known in their native lands, had heard of one another and each admired the other. After the introduction, active intercourse, oral and written, began and in a lively exchange of ideas the two poets influenced each other. On the twenty-second of June, 1842, Freiligrath sent his works to Longfellow, who was delighted with them. On July 2, 1842, the latter answered: "Meanwhile I have been reading your own, original poems ever and ever with new delight. They are fresh, vigorous and striking in the highest degree." This delving into Freiligrath's works, at that time as well as later, must have had a great influence on Longfellow, an influence that criticism has always suspected but never proved in detail. From the unpublished letters which were kindly put at my disposal by the descendants of Longfellow and Freiligrath, my long held presumption that Longfellow's "Poems on Slavery" show to a great extent the influence of Freiligrath can, I think, now be proved. Longfellow wrote these poems on the open sea during the latter

part of October, 1842, when, after having sealed his friendship with Freiligrath, he was on his way back to America.

Throughout these seven poems, one is impressed with Freiligrath's personality, his peculiar, characteristic style, and his strange, far-fetched rimes. The hot sun of Africa lies brooding on these creations, and a fragrant atmosphere permeates them, as with analogous productions of Freiligrath's Muse. For comparison, one may read these "Poems on Slavery" along with Freiligrath's "Alexandriner" poems, of 1838.<sup>1</sup> Without tracing the 'similarities' in detail, the *Quadroon Girl* may be compared with *Scipio*, p. 77; *The Witnesses* perhaps with *Die Toten im Meere*, p. 90; *The Slave in the Dismal Swamp* with *Der Mohrenfürst*, or with *Der Löwenritt*, and especially with *Leben des Negers*, where the borrowing in certain places extends even to words. This last-mentioned poem of Freiligrath must, as regards both content and form, have been most welcome to Longfellow as material for his poems on slavery. Here, as in Freiligrath's poem, a poor negro in the yoke of slavery, is forced to labor in a foreign land, far away from his beloved home, with its natural beauty and charms, its gold and its wealth. The following lines may serve as examples for comparison. Longfellow:<sup>2</sup>

Wide through the landscape of his dreams  
The lordly Niger flowed;  
Beneath the palm-trees on the plain  
Once more a king he strode;  
And heard the tinkling caravans  
Descend the mountain-road.

Freiligrath:<sup>3</sup>

Da!—Palmenwälder dunkeln;  
Hyän' und Löwe dräun;  
Auf Königshäuptern funkeln  
Gold, Perl' und Edelstein!

Aus unerforschten Quellen  
Rauscht stolz der Niger her;  
Mit hunderttausend Wellen  
Braust auf das heil'ge Meer.

<sup>1</sup> Freiligraths Werke, Goldene Klassiker-Bibliothek, I, 68, ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Slave's Dream*, second stanza.

<sup>3</sup> *Leben des Negers*, seventh and eighth stanzas.

Could "the lordly Niger flowed" and "Rauscht stolz der Niger her" be a chance congruence? Longfellow himself knew and felt that in *The Slave's Dream* much from Freiligrath had crept in, and he openly admitted it, as one of his unpublished letters shows. He writes on the sixth of January, 1843, from Cambridge: "We had a very boisterous passage. I was not out of my berth more than twelve hours for the first twelve days. . . . thus . . . I passed fifteen days. During this time I wrote seven poems on *slavery*. . . . A small window in the side of the vessel admitted light into my berth; and there I lay on my back, and soothed my soul with songs. I send some copies. In "The Slave's Dream" I have borrowed one or two wild animals from your menagery."

This casual hint establishes Longfellow's attitude in this matter. A borrowing is evident, yet seldom can a literal borrowing be proved. The American poet was great enough to acknowledge independently a thought or expression that had pleased him and remained fixed in his memory. And if he later made use of the one or the other, he put an individual stamp upon it which states clearly and distinctly: Now I am American, now I am Longfellow.

A. H. APPELMANN.

University of Vermont.

#### THE TEXT OF SIR GAWAYNE AND THE GREEN KNIGHT

*Syr Gawayne; A Collection of Ancient Romance-Poems, by Scottish and English Authors, relating to that celebrated Knight of the Round Table.* By Sir FREDERIC MADDEN, 1839. [B]

*Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, E. E. T. S., Original Series 4, 1864, revised edition 1869; reprinted 1893. [M]

*Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, E. E. T. S. 4, fourth edition, revised, 1897 [by I. GOLLANCZ]; reprinted 1905, 1908, 1910. [G]—Revised in 1912. [G<sup>2</sup>]

The number of errata in a text so repeatedly and carefully collated with the MS. must of necessity be very small. And yet a re-examina-

tion of the MS. last summer has proved fruitful, resulting in the correction of a few very minor errors, of one curious misreading, and, above all, in the discovery of several readings where the MS. has been taken to be illegible, and which it had been regarded as necessary to supply conjecturally. The following are unindicated disagreements between the MS. and G<sup>2</sup>:

51 *krystes* BM, MS, *kryste* M<sup>2</sup> (revised ed., 1869), G. (The same contraction is expanded by G into *-es* in 62, 621, 877, 1111.)—137 on *pe molde* BMG, in *pe molde* MS. There is a trace of some partly erased or faded character on the upper left hand corner of the *i*, but the combination is not anything like an *o*.—461 *fram* G, *from* MS. This should be expanded into *from*.—518 *woxes* G, *waxes* MS.—646 *ioyeg* G, *ioyeg* MS.—663 *pus* alle BMG, *ryally* MS. The word is a trifle rubbed, but is perfectly clear.—718 *So* G, *fo* MS.—815 *pat* G, *p<sup>e</sup>* MS.—910 *joye* G, *ioye* MS.—1063 *if* G, *If* MS.—1230 *iwyssse* G, *Iwyssse* MS.—1369 *lord* G, *lorde* MS. Part of the *e* is rubbed away, but so much remains as to make its presence certain.—1447 *myry* BMG, *nnyry* (or *miyry*) MS.—1719 *lift* G, and in *fn. lift*. As *ft* and *ft* are indistinguishable in the MS., this may be *ft*. The *fn.* is therefore unnecessary.—1720 *mute* BM, *muete* G, *mute* MS.—2027 *vertuuus* BM, *vertuus* G, *vertuuus* MS. (As *u* and *o* sometimes are similar, the second *u* may be an *o* unclosed at the top.)—2523 *bokees* G, *bokeg* MS.

The most interesting group of restorations of original readings occurs in 1442–45. These are the last four lines on fol. 110a (new number 114a). The first words in these lines are absolutely undecipherable, the ink having been almost or quite removed from the whole lower left-hand corner of the page. On the opposite page, however, in the lower right-hand corner, there seem to be a group of random pen scratches, fortunately on a space left blank because the lines of the poem are not long enough to extend clear across the page. The connection between the denuded spot on fol. 110a and these scratchings on fol. 109b is not immediately apparent because the MS. has been rebound, and to preserve it more effectually, the binder introduced a sheet of blank paper between every two pages. The undecipherable marks, however, are to be connected with the damaged spot on the opposite page. And when held up to a mirror their significance becomes clear. The MS. had at some time become damp, so damp, in fact, that the ink was softened in this lower inner corner of fol. 110a, and then stuck to the opposite page. When the MS., meanwhile dried out, was next opened at this place, the ink had become so firmly attached to

the opposite page that it was almost completely pulled off from its original page, leaving little or nothing there. The lost words, hitherto conjecturally supplied, and printed in brackets, may therefore now be restored with certainty from this "offset," as printers call a similar phenomenon.

On fol. 110a lines 1442-5 read:

. . . re quen he gronyed þenne greued mony  
For . . . t þe fyrst þrast he þrygt to þe erþe  
& . . . forth good sped boutte spyt more  
. . . halowed hyghe ful hyge & hay hay cryed

The lacunae are thus supplied in M and G:

[And eue]re  
For [pre a]t  
& [sped hym]  
[Ande þay]

The lines, with the readings from the "offset," are:

[hise (?) ] gryndre quen he gronyed þenne greued mony  
For þre at þe fyrst þrast he þrygt to þe erþe  
& spede rad forth good sped boutte spyt more  
þise oper halowed hyghe ful hyge & hay hay cryed.

The first word of line 1442, *hise*(?), is extremely uncertain, as part of it is still on the original page and part on the opposite, and the two parts do not seem to fit together. The word *rad* in 1444 is also not quite so certain as the rest. But the other readings are absolutely certain.

It seems rather curious that the conjectural readings in 1443-44 should agree so closely with the restorations. These readings, according to Madden, in his *Corrections and Additions*, were suggested to him by Rev. R. Garnett. Madden says, "The hiatus may be restored with certainty." It seems almost as if Garnett must have noticed the "offset," and read it, except for the fact that he did not read line 1445 also, which is as clear as the others. (I ought to add that Madden prints 1445 as "Ande þay" without brackets.)

There are on other pages several other lacunae, of no special importance, however, which are legible in similar "offsets," and which therefore need no longer be conjecturally restored.

1433 [þay]. "þa" is perfectly legible in the offset, and "ay" is fairly clear on the original page.

1706 [w]eterly. *w* is clear in the offset. (*w* is unbracketed in BM, though it is bracketed in M<sup>2</sup>, revised ed. of 1869.)

1745 reads *w<sup>t</sup>* chere. BMG have a note to "with," saying, "bi, à sec. manu." What is here taken for "bi, à sec. manu," is apparently

written immediately below the *w<sup>t</sup>*. As a matter of fact, it does look like *bi*, but, read in a mirror, it turns out to be part of the word *ful*, from 1706 on the opposite page.

In 2178-79 the first words are *þen[n]e* and *D[e]batande*. Here again the offset takes the letters *n* and *e* out of the realm of conjecture.

In 2187-88 the first words are *He[re]* and *[þ]e*. In the offset the whole word *here* is clear, as is also the *þ*.

In 2329 the word [schaped] is supplied, with the fn. "Illegible." Madden had simply left a blank space for the word, and Morris had supplied [sikered], both with the fn. "Illegible." Part of the word is clear on the original page, and most of the rest may be made out in the offset. The word is *schapen*. G's conjecture thus turns out to be nearly correct.

Gollancz deserves great credit for discarding some of the old but unnecessary emendations (however enticing they may appear) that were inherited from Madden and Morris, and for rejecting two in 1912 that he had himself introduced in 1897. Those which B, M, and sometimes G<sup>1</sup> had adopted into the text, but which G<sup>2</sup> (and sometimes G<sup>1</sup>) abandoned, are: 11 [turnes]; 651 fyrst M, fyft MS., G; 1161 [þat]; 1440 [seuered] M, [woned] G<sup>1</sup>; 1510 [ar]; 1808 [on]; 2111 [I]; 86 Io[l]yfnes G<sup>1</sup>. Besides these, B and M had suggested in footnotes twenty-four others, which G has not adopted: 334, 440, 558, 893, 988, 1114, 1188, 1281, 1304, 1355, 1480, 1513, 1572, 1578, 1671, 1700, 1878, 1962, 1995, 2002, 2018, 2167, 2422, 2447.

A rather striking restoration by G occurs in 1497. The ms. reads: "gif any were so vilanous þat yow de vaye wolde." B and M, probably on the basis of *denayed* in 1493, and because *devayen* is elsewhere unknown in English, had changed the ms. in 1497 to *denaye*, recording the ms. reading in a footnote. Superficially, the change seems necessary. G, however, restores the ms. because the alliteration requires it. *devaye* is unquestionably the Anglo-French word *deve(y)er*, Old French *deveer* (Latin *deveto*), 'refuse.' The *y* was probably introduced through confusion with *deniier* (Latin *denego*), because of the practical identity of meaning. The past participle occurs in the form *deveyé* in the Anglo-French *Boeve de Haumtone*, line 1315. G is therefore right in rejecting *denaye*.

Textually, all this elimination marks a great editorial advancement, for in spite of the one hundred and twenty-five emendations that remain, every attempt to read and restore the ms. is a gain.



In dealing with texts, and especially with one-manuscript texts, there is still too much editorial inclination to make use of the "direct method" whenever an apparently unreadable passage is met—namely, to rewrite it into intelligibility. The only alternative is time-consuming and laborious, and is only too likely not to be very fruitful. Exhaustive search through dictionaries and glossaries, and extensive reading in works of the period for other cases of obscure words, parallel passages, and constructions that will throw light on the difficulties of the text at hand, do not offer an inviting prospect to the ordinary editor. Consequently our Middle English texts are too full of emendations, many of them, it is true, superficially convincing, many of them on close observation and study absolutely unnecessary or evidently unsatisfactory, and many others doomed as soon as some student points out the parallel passages that we need to prove the ms. text to be readable and significant. It is perhaps too much to hope that all editors will abstain as rigorously as possible from introducing these "editorially re-written" passages into their texts, but it is not too much to hope that gradually students may add to the small but important body of contributions furnishing us commentaries on obscure and supposedly unreadable passages in Middle English.

Fortunately the text of *Gawayne and the Green Knight* has been from the beginning in the hands of conservative scholars who have rarely permitted their mere ingenuity to exercise itself on the ms. readings. The abandonment by Gollancz of these old emendations, and the very sparing introduction of new ones, is extremely commendable, and sets a high mark for other scholars to aim at.

That the scribe of this ms. did make mistakes, however, is abundantly demonstrable. Omitting actual *lacunae* in the ms., where letters or words have been rubbed away or pulled off in the offset, there are over one hundred and twenty-five cases of changed or omitted words, or of bracketed parts of words or whole words in G<sup>2</sup>. Of these rather more than half are transparently justifiable. To begin with, there are ten clear cases of dittography where a whole word is repeated: 95 of of; 182 as as; 1255 pat pat; 1712 to to; 1830 pat pat; 1919 her her; 2137 & &; 2247 by by; 2305 he he; 2426 with wyth. (Moreover, the number of similar errors in the other poems in the same ms. is large.) There are three cases consisting of the repetition of a syllable at the end of a word: 58 werere; 1693 bi forere; 2390 hardilyly. Cf. with these *Cleanness* 1460 ferlyle.

With these undoubtedly should be classed *Gaw.* 1962 sellyly. The change of this to selly, suggested in the BM fns., may consequently be justified. There is another case of what amounts to the same sort of dittography as in werere in 634 verertueg. (A somewhat similar error occurs in 219 in noghee. Here the *h* is crossed with the usual abbreviation for final *-e*, then the *-e* is also written.)

Another group of scribal slips is to be found in 705 clapel; 850 clesly; 930 claplayneg; 1286 schulde. In all these the second stroke of an *h* has been carelessly omitted in the writing.

In another group *f* has been miswritten for *f*: 282, 384, 718, 1304 *fo* for *fo*; in 1583 *f* for *f*: luflych; in 850 clefly for chefly. In another group *n* occurs instead of *m*, or *vice versa*, or *nn* (four vertical strokes instead of three) for *m*. 629 emdeleg; 865 hyn; 1037 nerci; 1810 tyne; 2240 welcon; 2131 mot; 1447 nnyry; 1690 nnorsel. (For an interesting parallel see *Pearl* 557, where *om* is altered to *on* by the scribe, according to Osgood.)

In another group the nasal contraction has been omitted: 432 ru[n]yschly; 774 say[n] (though M, G read say[nt]); 1262 a[n]swared; 1376 gaway[n]; 1981 agay[n]; 2010 lau[m]pe.

In two cases *for* seems to have been miswritten for *fro*: 1440, 1863. In one case, 1389 *ho* occurs where the context requires *he*; in one case, 1872 *he* where it requires *ho*. (ms. *e* is very different from *o*.)

In three cases final *-ee* has been emended to *-e*: 844 eldee; 1565 madee; 2241 truee. But in three other cases the *-ee* has not been changed: 1274 trwee; 1378 schyree; 1707 tornayeeg. This seems to be an editorial inconsistency.

In 22 cases one or two letters are omitted by the scribe: 203 hawb[e]rgh; 751 seruy[se]; 803 in-n[o]ghe; 877 pa[t]; 883 c[h]efly; 1030 p[e]; 1069 pa[t]; 1092 gow[r]e; 1129 he[r]; 1357 a[y]per; 1479 sof[t]ly; 1611 [s]chelde; 1815 [n]ogt; 1825 swere[s]; 1825 swyftel[y]; 1858 myg[t]; 1973 f[e]rk; 2223 [t]o; 2291 h[i]s; 2296 bihou[e]s; 2337 r[a]ykande; 2461 g[l]opnyng.

There are some other errors, unclassifiable, but none the less certainly errors: 1799 *of* for *if*; 2343 *uf* for *if*; 686 pad for pat (the following word begins with *d*); 813 *trowoe* for *trowee*, *trowe*; and the misplaced abbreviation for *er* in 124 syluener for sylueren. (Cf. 886 syluer-in, and *Cleanness* 1406 sylueren; and especially the similar error in *Cleanness* 127, where the ms. has pouener instead of poueren.)

There remain over fifty emendations, many of which seem to be more or less unacceptable

for one reason or another. Some of these fall into classes, but many must be discussed individually.

822 quil, ms. quel. If the editor were governed by consistency, this change would involve normalizing the spellings of the whole ms., a process the wisdom of which would certainly be questionable.

825 burne, ms. buurne. The ms. here might just as well be left unchanged.

2205 as, ms. at, is simply a change in the direction of making the ms. "readable," though perhaps this is a case of scribal error.

591 ou[p]er. ms.: þe lest lachet ouer loupe lemed of golde. On Gawayn's armor we might as well have "latchets over, above loop;" as "latchets or loops." (Some support for the change, however, may be found in *Pearl* 138, where *oper* may be an error for *ouer*. See Os-good, fn.)

660 [a]i quere, ms. I quere. This may be a case of merely the careless omission of one letter. But the capital *I* seems to argue against the supposition.

There are also a very considerable number of words inserted by the editors for one reason or another, mostly, however, obviously "to make the sense smoother." Those which do not seem to be vital are: 100 [þe]; 1413 [&]; 1580 [&]; 1639 [hent]; 1648 [on]; 1752 [dygt hym]; 1861 [ho]; 2344 [&]; 2448 [hatg]; 2472 [bikennen]; 2506 [in]; perhaps 1936 [þe] is needed.

1386 reads: & I haf worthyly þis woneg wythinne. G rewrites this as follows: [þat] I haf worthyly [wonne] þis woneg wythinne. Evidently he takes þis to be a demonstrative modifying woneg. It may, however, be a forward referring pronoun signifying the kiss which Gawayn, the speaker, delivers in the next few lines. The emendation is unnecessary.

1441 reads, as far as it is to be read with certainty: for he watg . . . or alþer gratest. G makes this: For he watg b[este] baleful &] bor alþer gratest. His fn. is: ms. b[este &]; illegible; baleful, conjectural.

The "illegible" part of this line is extremely hard to read. Here, as in several other places, the scribe obliterated the word he first wrote by rubbing it with his finger while the ink was still wet. The "correct" word was then written upon the blot, in a second hand and ink, like some other words in 43, 81, and 1214; the ink is a darker brown than the original (see below). There are four letters upon the blot. The first might be either *b* or *h*. The tails of both strokes are gone, but evidently the character was not closed at the bottom, and I there-

fore take it to be *h*. The last letter when read in sunlight is plainly *e*. The second and third are uncertain. The second looks like *o*, the third like *g*. I take the word therefore to be *hoge*, a common enough spelling in this ms. for *huge*. There is no *ð*; the final *e* has been mistaken for *ð*. The first letter of the next word is also doubtful. It may be *b* or *h*. The second stroke has not so long a tail as is usual in *h*, but on the other hand the character is not closed at the bottom, and seems therefore likely to be *h*. The line then reads: for he watg hoge, hor alþer gratest, perfectly good Middle English for 'For he was huge, greatest of them all.'

An old emendation, first introduced by Madden, is in 427: þe fayre hede fro þe halce hit [felle] to þe erþe. As Napier showed with illustrations in *Mod. Lang. Quarterly* I (1897), p. 52, the word *hit* is a verb meaning 'came, fell and struck'; see also Napier, *Mod. Lang. Notes* 17, col. 170, and Kölbing, *Eng. Stud.* 26, 402. The conjectural word is therefore superfluous.

286 reads: Be so bolde in his blod, brayn[-wod] in hys hede. The emendation was suggested by Mätzner, but was not put into the text by Morris. At first it seems a good suggestion, but it turns out to be unnecessary. In Gawain Douglas's *Aeneis*, cited in the *N.E.D.* s. v. *brain*, we find the line, "He walxis brayne in furour bellicall," the meaning of "brayne" quite evidently being 'mad.' Cf. also the *N.E.D.* s. v. *brainish*: Palsgrave, "Braynishe, hedy, folisshe, selfe wylded;" Shakspere, *Hamlet* 4, 1, 11; and Drayton, *Heroic Ep. Pref.*, "The Worke might in truth be judged Braynish."

A considerable number of emendations involving the change, omission, or reinterpretation of a letter, suggested or introduced by B or M, are in G's text. Among those which are probably admissible are: 1032 þ, ms. &; 1124 lede, ms. leude (rime 'gede'); 1412 crowe, ms. crowe; 1588 freke, ms. freke; 1906 hym, ms. by; 1909 bray, ms. bray; and a group in which G reads *u* where M read *n*: 1047 derue; 985 meue; 1157 meue; 1743 wayueg.

The word wayueg, wayued occurs in the poem seven times: 264, 306, 984, 1032, 1743, 2456, 2459. M printed it wayned everywhere except in 306, where he had wayueg. Skeat, however, pointed out in *Trans. of the Philol. Socy.* 27 (1885-87), p. 365, that the word wayne is a ghost-word originating in Stevenson's edition of *Alexander*. The Dublin ms. of that poem, however, by spelling the word wayfeg, identifies it with "waff, waif, wauff,"

in Jamieson. Chaucer has weyven in rime. It must be observed, on the other hand, that the word occurs twice in *Pearl* in rime, wayneg 131, vayned 249. It surely looks as if we have to deal with two words in ME.; see Bradley-Stratmann s. v. *waiven*, and also *waven*. Wayven, waynen, and weven seem to have been thoroughly confused. At any rate, we should print wayued in *Gaw.* 984.

In 2290 ryueg M, ryneq G, the word, so far as the context is concerned, might mean either 'rive, split,' or 'touch,' going back to ON. *rifan* or OE. *hrinan*. But undoubtedly the sense 'touch' is better. The green knight 'strikes at him mightily, but does not touch him.'

One cannot feel quite certain about the change in 1315 watg G, w<sup>t</sup> MS. In 1696 casteq G, costeq MS., the MS. reading is perfectly satisfactory. In 1921 tyruen, and 1514 teuelyng, G improves by reading *u* for *n* M.

An interesting reading occurs in 956, where BMG read the MS. *scheder*, and M suggested, and G adopts *schedes*. Light on this reading is to be found in *Pearl* 1068, where Morris and Osgood read the MS. as *anvndeg*, and change it to *an-vnder*. *g* and one kind of *r* look very much alike in this MS., and the MS. in 956 is undoubtedly to be interpreted as *schudeg*, and in *Pearl* 1068 as *an-vnder*. Note, in the facsimile in Osgood, the *r* of *by-fore*, l. 6, and the *g* of *loueg* and of *syge*, l. 20.

438 reads: As non vnhap had hym ayled, þag hedleg no we (*or ho we*). For no we (*or ho we*) B prints *ho we*, with the fn. *he were*? M prints the text as B, with the fn. *he were* (?) *or nowe* (?), but M<sup>2</sup> puts *he we[re]* into the text. I am inclined to believe that the MS. should be read *no we*, i. e., *nowe*, even though the first stroke of the *n* is a trifle higher than is usual in this character, and the second stroke runs a trifle lower than usual.

It remains to speak of the sixteen absolutely new emendations which G<sup>1</sup> or G<sup>2</sup> has introduced. The most striking are as follows: 884 reads: Sone watg telded vp a tapit on tresteg ful fayre. For tapit G substitutes *tabil*. Other instances where tables and trestles are mentioned together are in 1648, *Cleanness* 832, *Babees Book* p. 311, l. 389, and p. 326, l. 822, and *Sir Degrevant* 1381-2. The emendation seems convincing.

881 reads: [A mantle] Alle of ermyn in erde, his hode of þe same. For *in erde* G substitutes *enurnde*. This seems to be supported by 634 and 2027. There, however, and elsewhere where the word *enournd* occurs, it is used of precious stones, jewelry, or figuratively.

Furthermore, though the phrase in *erde* does not seem to have much force here, it must be remembered that elsewhere in the poem the same phrase is used in the same colorless fashion, as a sort of tag for alliterative purposes. See 27, 140, 2416, and 1070 *vpon grounde*, 486 in *londe*, 614 in *tonne*, in all of which 'in the world' seems to have a vague meaning not especially suitable to the context. The emendation is a gratuitous "improvement."

In 1729 *bi lag mon* MS., *bi-lag[gid] mon* G, the emendation is convincing. See Bradley-Stratmann, s. v. *Bilaggen*, and Way's *Promptorium Parvulorum*, s. v. *Laggyd*, p. 283, and *Be-laggyd*, p. 29, and note 5.

In 992 MS., BMG<sup>1</sup> read *kyng*. But the person referred to, the lord of the castle, is not regarded as a king in this poem (though he may have been in the sources). The rejection of *kyng*, therefore, seems imperative, and G<sup>2</sup> substitutes 'lord.' My colleague, Dr. J. R. Hulbert, however, suggests *knygt* as a far less violent change. It is far easier to understand how the scribe should write 'kyng' for 'knygt' than 'kyng' for 'lord.' In *Sir Perceval of Galles*, 83, we find MS. 'kynghete' for 'knyghte,' and the same error frequently in *Sir Degrevant*. (See *Thornton Roms.*, p. 259.) 'kynghete' might readily become the still more erroneous form 'kyng.'

In 683 the change of *cauelounq* to *cauel[aci]ounq* appears advisable. The latter reading is supported by 2275. In 88 *leng* MS. has been changed to *longe*, probably an advisable change.

A series of changes in the direction of making the text read more grammatically, or more nearly in conformity with the context, is: In 795 *towre* MS., *Towre[s]* G, because in this sentence the various other parts of the castle are spoken of in the plural. But may there not have been only one tower? In 727 *schadden* MS., *schadde* G, to make this verb agree with the subject *water*. In 987 *wedeg* MS., *wede* G, the singular is adopted because the reference is to the hode of 983. In 1141 *mote* MS., *motes* G, the plural is adopted because the adjective is *pre*. In 1836 *nay* MS., *nay[ed]* G, the preterite is adopted to conform with the context. In 734 *caryeg* MS., *cayreg* G, because elsewhere in this MS. the word is regularly spelled *cayre*, *kayre* (see glossary). There is of course no question that etymologically the word is *cayren*, ON. *keyra*, 'to drive.' But the word became practically fused in meaning and form in ME. with *carien*, so that *carien* might be used with the original meaning of *cayren*. This is best illustrated in *Piers Plowman*,



A-text, prol. 29; of twelve mss., four have some form of *cairen*, while eight have *carien*; in 4.22 three have *cairiþ*, while ten have *carieþ*. The word in both cases means 'go,' and should etymologically be *cairen*. Therefore, in *Gawain*, in spite of the other spelling in 2120, 1048, 1670, the temptation to "regularize" the reading of 734 ought to be resisted.

1467 reads: *Suande þis wylde swyn til þe sunne shafted*. For shafted G reads shifted. I am unable to cite any other instance of the verb shaften referring to the sun's beams, but there are so many cases in M. E. of the noun shaft, meaning figuratively the rays of the sun, that I feel the ms. should not be disturbed. In the *Wars of Alexander*, 1544 and 4816, we have the phrase "shaftis of þe shire sor." *Pearl* 982 reads: "þe brok . . . þat schyrrer þen sunne with schafteþ schon." *Patience* 455 has: "þe schyre sunne hit vmbe-schon, þag no schafte mygt þe mountaunce of a lyttel mote vpon þat man schyne."

Three absolutely unnecessary changes have been made in 2053 þay ms., he G; 1112 þis ms., þe G; 1514 þis ms., þe G.

In 1769 G<sup>2</sup> has capitalized ms. mare, making it signify the Virgin Mary (*i. e.*, 'If Mary should not think of her knight, Great peril would exist between them'—Gawain and the lady). As Dr. Hulbert points out, however, the next stanza makes this appear not to be the meaning. Gawain was in danger of yielding to the gentle seductiveness of the lady, and might have done so had he not thought more of her (*i. e.*, the lady's) knight, lest he 'should be traitor to that man who owned that mansion' (1775). As Gawain is here being subjected to a severe test of his loyalty (loyalty, generosity, and courtesy were the three qualities especially demanded of the knight), the interference of the Virgin would spoil the whole crucial part of the test, and seems inconceivable from such an artist as our poet.<sup>1</sup> If it be objected that mynnen is not used in M. E. in the sense 'come to mind,' it may be answered that mare may be a fusion of mare he, a suggestion of Dr. Hulbert's. Furthermore, that the scribe did not understand the reference here to be to the Virgin appears from his regular spelling of her name elsewhere: 754, 1268, 1942, 2140, mary.

Putting 1283-87 into quotation marks greatly improves the sense. The punctuation of 2208, making it clear that wee loo is an exclamation, is another improvement.

<sup>1</sup> The ordeal of Gawain is not a "chastity test," as is commonly asserted. This will appear in Dr. Hulbert's forthcoming paper on the poem.

One set of facts about the ms. has been obscured by the E. E. T. S. editions. It has to do with the first lines—the short ones—of the rimed five-line bits at the end of the stanzas. These are correctly printed by B where they occur in the ms. They never occur in the positions that they have been put into in the E. E. T. S. edition. They always, on the contrary, occur in the right hand margin, opposite some other line, sometimes the preceding, sometimes the following, and frequently some lines before the preceding line, where they often fit the sense much better. For example, 15 is opposite 12; 32 opp. 30 (it must, of course, refer forwards to 31); 55 opp. 53 (where it fits better); 80 opp. 77; 102 opp. 103; 125 opp. 123; 146 opp. 144; 174 opp. 172; 198 opp. 196 (with forward reference); 227 opp. 225; 274 opp. 273; 296 opp. 294; 318 opp. 317; 338 opp. 336 (does not fit); 361 opp. 360; 385 opp. 384; 412 opp. 411; 439 opp. 437; 462 opp. 460; 486 opp. 484; 511 opp. 509 (fits better); 531 opp. 529; 561 opp. 560; 585 opp. 583; 614 opp. 612; 635 opp. 634; other especially notable cases are: 1258 opp. 1254; 1397 opp. 1395; 1714 opp. 1712; 1865 opp. 1862; 1888 opp. 1886; 1947 opp. 1944; 2020 opp. 2017.

The student might well wish that the exact condition of the ms. in doubtful, "illegible," and other emended passages had been more explicitly described. I may, therefore, perhaps be pardoned for giving some additional information. The editor is not consistent in telling in his footnotes when letters and parts of words have been conjecturally supplied in blank or defaced spaces, and when they have been inserted where there is no space. In 312 gry[n]del-layk there is room for one letter where *n* has been inserted. In 659 nouþ[er], the last part of the word has been badly rubbed; þ is barely legible; as the word is at the end of the line, either *-er* or the abbreviation for *-er* has been undoubtedly defaced. In 1199 [in], there is an erasure of two letters. In 1514 F[or], the ms. has been badly smudged over the *-or*; the *o* is faint but legible. In 1516 le[des], the ms. is defaced; B prints le . . . ; only the *l*- is now really legible; there is room for *-edes*. In 1706 h[ym], BM print hym without brackets; M<sup>2</sup> prints h[ym]; there is now absolutely no trace of the *y* or the nasal stroke above it, but there is room for the *y* plus the regular space between words. In 2171 we[re], at the end of the line, there is no trace of *-re*. Of course in all cases of the offset mentioned above, there are blank spaces on the original page.

In the following cases there is no space in

the ms., and that fact is clearly stated in the footnotes: 286, 683, 751, 795, 1729, 1752, 1815, 1825 (swere[s]), 1836, 1858, 2448 (the fn. is slightly misleading; the word *hatz* has been inserted), 2461.

In the following cases there is no space or erasure, but no indication is so given in the footnotes: 100, 203, 591, 660, 803, 877, 1030, 1069, 1092, 1129, 1357, 1413, 1479, 1580, 1611, 1639, 1648, 1825 (swyftel[y]), 1861, 1936, 1973, 2223, 2291, 2296, 2337, 2344, 2472, 2506.

In 1466 r[od]e, and 1467 wy[ld]e, a drop of water on the page has dimmed the ink, but the bracketed letters are perfectly legible except the *o* of rode, which looks to me more like *y*, though it may be *o*.

In 1213 g[aye], the scribe's pen seems to have been going badly, and it is impossible to make out what he intended the word to be. The *g* is very light and small, and the rest of the word trails off into a mere shriveled scrawl.

In 43 make is written in a dark brown ink, very different from the regular ink, and in an entirely different hand from the rest, over a smudged erasure (cf. "hoge," 1441). In 81 discrye, discry- is again in the dark ink and the second hand over a smudged spot; the *-e* is in the original ink and hand. In 1214 wel is in the dark ink and second hand above the line; a caret below the space between me and lyke seems in the original ink and hand.

In 1591 wy[ɣ]test, the *ɣ* is legible enough not to require brackets.

In 1256 the ms. is perfectly clear in reading loune; there is no doubt about the reading. The footnote is misleading.

In 2344 anger, the ang- is rubbed and faint, but legible, and there is a trace of the abbreviation for *-er*. In 2440 ɣonde[r], the *r* is a trifle defaced but perfectly clear (*G*<sup>2</sup> reads ɣonde).

1540 toruayle. T. G. Foster, in *Mod. Lang. Quarterly* I (1897), p. 54, says: "I have looked at the ms. carefully, and read *trauayle*, not *toruayle*; this reading suits the context exactly." I have examined this word with great care, and while I cannot speak with quite such assurance as Foster, I believe that the ms., while superficially looking like *tor-* rather than *tra-*, nevertheless probably ought to be read *tra-*; the third letter almost certainly is *a*.

There are a very few minor misprints. In 345 pis, the *p* is broken. In 1303 knygt, the *y* is broken. In 1486 bi had better be printed with a capital B. In 1729 mon should be followed in the text by <sup>3</sup>. In 850 cheffy should read cheffy<sup>2</sup>. On p. 30, fn. 1, why the brackets?

On p. 32, fn. 1 should read *kyng*. Why are two kinds of type—boldface and Roman—used in the motto at the close of the poem? Nothing in the ms. justifies them.

THOMAS A. KNOTT.

University of Chicago.

---

*On Vowel Alliteration in the Old Germanic Languages*, by E. CLASSEN. University of Manchester Publications, Germanic Series, No. 1. Manchester University Press, 1913. xi + 91 pp., 3 sh. 6 d.

The extremely perplexing question of vowel alliteration in the Old Germanic languages has never been satisfactorily solved. The glottal-catch theory and the sonority or acoustic theory are both extremely doubtful. The above monograph seeks, by historical evidence, to throw light upon the theory of vowel identity as the original principle controlling vowel alliteration. The work is divided into an Introduction and two Parts. The Introduction contains a concise history of the controversy. Part I contains an analysis of the three theories advanced, and Part II the author's investigation of minor monuments, and a comparison with Celtic, Finnish and Latin alliteration. The minor monuments of Germanic literature investigated are confined to *Béowulf*, the *Heliand* and the Old Norse Eddic lays, *Vølundarkviða*, *Hyndluljóð*, *Þrymskviða* and *Hymiskviða*. The work is arranged in logical order, preparing the reader for the analysis and application of the vowel-identity theory by setting forth the difficulties involved in the glottal-catch theory and the sonority theory. The monograph as a whole affords a convenient survey as regards the thesis involved, but the author's efforts to make his work compact often leave much open to conjecture and render his methods unclear.

The principal objections to the glottal-catch theory advanced by the author are, (1) that it is not at all certain that the glottal catch ever existed in the Old Germanic languages; (2) that even if its existence be assumed, the sound could not have acquired such promi-

nence as the conditions of alliteration demand, inasmuch as it never received an orthographical symbol; (3) the glottal-catch theory fails to account for the alliteration of a consonant (*v* in Old Norse, *h* in Anglo-Saxon and in Old Saxon) with a vowel. The glottal-catch theory is further elaborated by R. Hildebrand (*Z.f.d.d.Unt.*, V, 577), who compares it with the technique of rime. He starts from the thesis that the best rime is that which contains one element of identity and one element of difference. In the alliterative technique Hildebrand finds these necessary conditions of artistic perfection in the alliteration of the glottal catch as the identical element, combined with different vowels. This argument is well met by the author, who points out the simple fact that there is no analogy at all between a rime and a pair of alliterating vowels, so that no inference can be drawn from the technique of rime for that of alliteration.

The sonority or acoustic theory (*Klangfülle*) is more favorably viewed by the author. Here we are at least sure of the existence of vowel sonority, while we are not sure that there ever was a glottal catch. The sonority theory is based upon the assumption that, quite apart from any phonetic analysis, vowels as a group strike the hearer as having something in common, in spite of their difference in quality, whereas consonants do not. This theory, however, falls to the ground when we consider the fact that phonetic identity may be closer between certain consonants (*e. g.*, the labial explosives *b* and *p*) than between vowels of different quality (such as a palatal *i* and guttural *o*). The main point is the resemblance and not whether the resemblance consists of pure voice or any other peculiarity of articulation. The author's statement (p. 21) that "the sonority theory fails to account for the alliteration in O. Norse of *v*- with a vowel or of *j*- if we assume the latter to be consonantic," does not invalidate the sonority theory. It may well be that at the time of composition, P.G. *u*- remained a semi-vowel (consonantal *u*) in O. N., as Gering (*Z.f.d.Ph.*, XLII, 233) suggests, but at the time of the manuscripts *u* had become a bilabial or a labio-

dental spirant (*v*); so that when the time came for committing the poems of the Edda to writing, there would be a number of lines with the alliteration *v*: *vowel*, that is, lines with no text alliteration at all, which when traced back would be found to have vowel alliteration. The sonority theory might hold in such a case, inasmuch as the *v* of the text was originally a semi-vowel. The history of initial P. G. *u* in O. N., as Gering assumes it, is supported by Noreen (*Altisländische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>, § 242).

The vowel-identity theory was first advanced by the celebrated Swedish philologist, Axel Kock (*Östnordiska och Latinska Medeltidsord-språk*, Kjöbenhavn, 1889-94), and supported further by the Danish phonetician, Otto Jespersen (*Fonetik*, § 76, Amm. 2. Kjöbenhavn, 1899). The author seeks to produce evidence in favor of this theory, which never yet has been subjected to a historical test, by tracing back to their Old Germanic forms the actually existing alliterative lines. This procedure, as the author admits, can be nothing more than an experiment, inasmuch as even the oldest of the monuments examined (*Béowulf*) is no model of the original system, for almost all sound laws affecting vowels took effect prior to the composition of the poem. The system of vowel alliteration with identical vowels must have already broken down a considerable time before *Béowulf* was written. But the experiment is of value insofar as it may establish the fact that the frequency of identical alliteration considerably increases when older forms are substituted.

The hypothesis upon which the author's investigation proceeds is that originally in Old Germanic poetry only identical vowels could alliterate, just in the same way as only identical consonants could alliterate. The forces tending to disrupt this system must have been many and active. The poverty of the Old Germanic languages in initial vowels and the necessity of finding in a single line two words or more with such vowels must have imposed very severe restrictions on the liberty of expression of the poet. Added to the inherent germs of decay was the sensitiveness of vowels, as compared with consonants, to phonetic



change. These technical difficulties of vowel alliteration may account for the comparative rarity of double vowel alliteration, as well as for the rarity of words alliterating in initial *i*, *u*, and *o* in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon. But the author's suggestion (p. 25 f.) regarding the process of decay of this system of identical vowel alliteration is not at all convincing. The author contends that as soon as the type *v*, different *v* | *vx* = *a o* | *a x* was reached, then gradually and without shock to the ear would arise the type *vv* | different *v x* = *a a* | *o x*, which represents a complete breakdown of the system, inasmuch as the *Hauptstab* in this case no longer controls the alliteration. But why should this transition take place? If the alliteration originally existed between the *Hauptstab* and one identical initial vowel in the first half-line, then it is difficult to see how two identical vowels in the first half-line could alone constitute the alliteration unless one of these vowels alliterated with the *Hauptstab*. How does the identity of two alliterating vowels in the first half-line do away with the necessity of alliteration with the *Hauptstab*, when the *Hauptstab* must have originally controlled the alliteration? It is possible that the poverty of identical initial vowels would justify the expedient of dispensing with the *Hauptstab* as the controlling element of alliteration, but this assumption is at best forced and not at all "easy," as the author avers. If we assume that the *Hauptstab* no longer controlled the alliteration, then it is "easy" to conceive how all three stressed syllables might contain non-identical alliterating initial vowels, since this assumption no longer involves vowel identity at all, for identity of initial vowels in the first half-line without reference to the *Hauptstab* does not constitute alliteration. Therefore, all three alliterating vowels might become non-identical as soon as the *Hauptstab* was no longer the controlling element in the alliteration. Why then should the *Hauptstab* be taken into consideration if it was no longer involved in the alliteration? Excluding the question of the *Hauptstab* altogether, the author is forced to explain why the identity of two initial vowels was not necessary

for alliteration. To do this, he has resorted to the expedient of the *Hauptstab* (with non-identical initial vowel) which, according to his argument, no longer controlled the alliteration. The author's contention assumes the *Hauptstab* at the same time as both a non-controlling and a controlling element in the alliteration.

One may also take serious objection to the author's method (p. 35) of tracing the vowels back to their Old Germanic forms. He has traced all the vowels back to their Primitive Germanic forms except in the case of P.G. *æ* and *ǫ*, where he has represented the original P.G. vowels by what he considers as their equivalents in W.G. and P. Norse; in the former case (P.G. *æ*) by the W.G. = P. Norse *â* and in the latter case (P.G. *ǫ*) by *ö* wherever *ö* would occur in W.G. The author's treatment of the P.G. *ǫ* in Old Norse, however, does not accord with his marginal reductions in the text. He says (p. 35): "In O.N., on the other hand, where the change *u* > *o* is known to have taken place late, the *u* has been preferred." Selecting a single example from the *Hymiskviða* (23, 2):

*orms einbani oxa hǫfpi* (*o* < *wo* < *wu ei* < *ai o* < *o*)

we see that the Old Norse *ö*, occurring as the initial vowel respectively in *orms* and *oxa*, has been reduced by the author, not in each case to *ǫ*, but in the former case to *ǫ* and in the latter to *ö*, which contradicts his statement that "in O.N. the P.G. *ǫ* has been preferred." If, with his statement, the author meant to say: "Wherever in O.N. the change *u* > *o* is known to have taken place late, the *u* has been preferred," one might be able to account for this contradiction, but even then one is left in ignorance as to the conditions under which this change took place "late" in O. N. There is no evidence that such a phonetic change took place late in O. N. Even the old Runic inscriptions show evidence of the breaking of the P.G. *ǫ* to *ö* [Cf. Noreen, *Altisländische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>, § 154, 2. *worahtô* (Tune, 5th. cen.), *horna* (Gallehus, 4th. cen.)]. Besides, the *a*-umlaut (which most often caused this breaking) was undoubtedly older than either the *i*-

or the *u*-umlaut.<sup>1</sup> In the example quoted above, *ormr* is the Gothic *waúrms* pure and simple. There can be no question of an *a*-umlaut here, since the *a*-ending had already disappeared in P.G. In *oxa* (nom. *oxi* = Gothic *aúhsa*), on the other hand, where the *a*-ending was retained in P.G., the breaking of *u* to *o* must have occurred. The *o* in *ormr* is, therefore, of P.G., and not of specifically O.N. origin. The breaking of I.E. *u* to *o* in P.G. seems to have taken place uniformly before *r* or *h*, just as in Gothic. Wherever, under such circumstances, *u* occurs in the Germanic dialects, as in the O.H.G. *wurm* (i), m., such an *u* must be considered of later origin, due either to the *\*i* (*\*wormi* < *wurmi*, nom. pl.) of the inflectional ending or to the "inserted" *\*u* (*\*wor<sup>u</sup>m* < *\*wur<sup>u</sup>m wurm*) which was generated between the *r* and *m* of the stem. The initial P.G. vowels for these two words (*orms*, *oxa*) are rather the reverse of that which the author maintains, i. e. *orms* — *oxa*, *o* < *wo* — *o* < *u* instead of *o* < *wo* < *wu* — *o* < *o*. The contention that P.G. *ü*, whatever the nature of the vowel in the following syllable, did not maintain itself before *r* or *h*, but was broken to *ö* is brilliantly defended by L. F. Leffler, *Bidrag till läran om i-omljudet*, Nord. Tidskr. for filol. og. pœd., Ny række, II.

Furthermore, it may be questioned whether the short *ē*, which the author has postulated for the W.G. and O.N. forms, can in all cases be reduced to a P.G. *ē*. It is more likely that I.E. *ē* was retained in P.G. only before *r* or *h*, and, in all other cases, was, just as in Gothic, not *ē* but *ī*.<sup>2</sup>

The author's method of tracing back some of the alliterative vowels to their P.G. forms and others to their W.G. or to their Primitive O.N. forms is confusing. If it was the author's intention to examine the status of P.G. poetry, why not trace back all the vowels in question to their P.G. forms?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Adolf Holtzmann, *Altdeutsche Grammatik*, I. Bd., 2. Abteilung, p. 12 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Collitz, *Segimer oder: Keltische Namen in Germanischem Gewande*, J.E.G.Phil. VI, 253-306, who in this article entirely discards the theory of the P.G. *ē*.

The categories according to which the author has carried on his investigation are as follows:

I. *Text Identical Vowels*. (a) in all members; (b) in two members including the *Hauptstab*; (c) neither identical nor approximately identical when traced back.—II. *Text Vowels Approximately Identical*. (a) in all members; (b) in two members including the *Hauptstab*; (c) neither identical nor approximately identical when traced back.—III. *Historically Identical Vowels*. (a) in all members; (b) in two members including the *Hauptstab*.—IV. *Vowels Neither Historically Identical nor Text Identical*.

The investigation shows that in every poem examined not only do lines with text identical, text approximately identical and historically identical vowels (I, II and III), represent a higher percentage than do lines with different alliterating vowels (i. e., different both in the text and when traced back, IV), but that the same is also true of those lines which, according to the author (p. 64), possess "actual identity" of vowel alliteration. This evidence is strongly in favor of the vowel-identity theory. The author's use of the term "actual identity" (p. 64) is, however, misleading. To arrive at "actual identity" of vowel alliteration, he has subtracted sub-category *c* (I and II) from the remaining sub-categories (*a*, *b*) in I and II. Under the head of "actual identity" he has, therefore, included category II (*a*, *b*), containing text vowels approximately identical, which, even if they are found to be identical when traced back, can hardly be termed "actually identical," inasmuch as they are not identical in the text as well as when traced back. The fact that such vowels are approximately identical in the text excludes the possibility of their being "actually identical"; which term would imply a vowel identity both in the text and when traced back. Actual identity in this latter sense can be possible only with reference to category I, which contains only text identical vowels, and the author would have spared the reader much confusion if he had confined the term to this sense.

Again on page 86, the terms which the author uses are very inexact and misleading.

He says, for instance, that "those monuments which are the oldest should show the highest percentage of identical vowels, and this is the case, for *Béowulf* has 75.2 per cent., *Héliand* 74 per cent., and the *Völundarkviða* 82.6 per cent." He gives no intimation as to whether he means by "identical vowels," 'text identical' 'text approximately identical,' or 'historically identical' vowels. In his tables (p. 84) he carefully distinguishes these three categories but here he makes absolutely no distinction between them, leaving it to the reader to discover exactly what meaning he attaches to the term "identical vowels." Only by a comparison with his table of statistics is one able to determine which category is intended. Such a comparison shows that under this term the author has included all three categories of identical vowels.

Again, he says (p. 86): "From the statistical table it also appears that the *Héliand* has the largest percentage of text identical vowels (21 per cent.)." But a comparison with the statistical table shows us that the percentage stated by the author must have reference only to text identical vowels in all members (Ia). The percentage for text identical vowels should include those which are identical not only in all members (Ia) but also in two members including the *Hauptstab* (Ib); i. e., Ia + Ib.

Directly following his enumeration of the percentages of "text identical vowels" the author says (p. 86): "If one includes approximately identical vowels, *Béowulf* then shows the highest percentage of 36 as against 23 per cent. in the *Héliand*." A comparison with his table of statistics shows us that the percentages stated have reference only to text identical vowels in all members (Ia) + approximately identical vowels in all members (IIa). Here, too, under the head of approximately identical, as well as under that of text identical vowels (see above), the author has excluded those vowels which are found in two members including the *Hauptstab* (Ib + IIb). If we include this subcategory *b*, we find the percentage of text identical vowels (Ia and Ib) to be: *Béowulf* 24, *Héliand* 36 and the *Edda* 21. This does not, however, refute the author's conclusion (p. 86) that "the *Héliand* has the largest percentage of

text identical vowels," although the percentages recorded by the author (p. 86) are: *Béowulf* 16, *Héliand* 21, and the *Edda* 11, which, however, take no account of text identical vowels in two members including the *Hauptstab*, Ib. Similarly, if in the category of approximately identical vowels we include those which are found in two members including the *Hauptstab* (IIa + IIb), we find the percentage to be: *Béowulf* 31, *Héliand* 7, and the *Edda* 28. If this percentage be added to the percentage found in the category of text identical vowels (i. e., IIa,b + Ia,b), we have: *Béowulf* (24 + 31) 55, *Héliand* (36 + 7) 43, and the *Edda* (21 + 28) 49, which supports the author's assertion that *Béowulf* shows the highest percentage (i. e. of text identical + approximately identical vowels). The percentages recorded by the author (who has excluded text identical and approximately identical vowels in two members including the *Hauptstab*, i. e., Ib + IIb) are: *Béowulf* 36, *Héliand* 23.

According to the percentages recorded by the author, one must necessarily infer that he considers the *Völundarkviða* to be of earlier origin than either *Béowulf* or the *Héliand*. He says (p. 86): "Finally those monuments which are the oldest should show the highest percentage of identical vowels, and this is the case, for *Béowulf* has 75.2 per cent., *Héliand* 74 per cent., and the *Völundarkviða* 82.6 per cent." That the *Völundarkviða* could be of earlier origin than either of the other two poems mentioned is extremely doubtful. It is undoubtedly one of the oldest of all the Old Norse heroic lays,<sup>3</sup> but there is no evidence to the effect that it is of as early an origin even as the ninth century. It is probably not so old as the *Þrymskviða*, which is a purely mythological lay. The heroic lays are in general of later origin than the purely mythological lays, yet the author, in seeking to determine by a system of percentage the antiquity of the monuments examined, entirely discards whatever evidence the *Þrymskviða* might offer to this effect.

The retention of stereotyped traditional epic

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Finnur Jónson, *Den Islanske Litteraturs Historie*, 1907, p. 61.



formulas which had undergone phonetic change would hasten the decay of the original system of vowel identity. Likewise the development of originally identical vowels into vowels heard to be different but yet phonetically and acoustically very closely related would lead to the alliteration in new poems of similar, phonetically related, vowels which yet did not originate from identical vowels. The author's argument here (p. 31) is quite clear and convincing, provided we assume the alliteration still to be controlled by the *Hauptstab*. One would, therefore, naturally expect, as the author asserts, the percentage of text identical vowels in poems orally transmitted (*Edda*) to be less than in first-hand compositions, such as *Béowulf* and the *Héliand*. Such is the case according to the author's statement (p. 31): *Béowulf* 36 per cent., *Héliand* 31.5 per cent., *Vølundarkviða* 17 per cent., *Hyndluljóð* 24 per cent., and *Hymiskviða* 12 per cent. A glance at his table of statistics (p. 84) shows us, however, that the author's figures represent both *text* identical and approximately identical vowels in all members (Ia + IIa). It is evident that the author here (p. 31) has not only omitted text identical vowels in two members including the *Hauptstab* (Ib) but has also included approximately identical vowels under the head of "identical" vowels. On page 86 (as shown before) the term "identical" vowel includes not only these two categories but also "historically identical vowels." The loose use which the author makes of the term "identical" is extremely confusing. According to the author's statistics (p. 84) the percentages of text identical vowels should be: *Béowulf* 24.1 (text identical vowels Ia + Ib =  $80 + 42 = 122$ ; whole number of lines with vowel alliteration, 506; per cent., 24.1). *Héliand* 36 (Ia + Ib =  $21 + 15 = 36$ ; whole number of lines with vowel alliteration, 100; per cent., 36). Proceeding in the same way with the Eddic lays we find the percentage of text identical vowels to be: *Vølundarkviða* 30.4; *Hyndluljóð* 13, and *Hymiskviða* 14.7. But here the author has omitted the percentage for the *Þrymskviða*, which should be 29.2. Why should the evidence which the *Þrymskviða* might offer be rejected, especially when, being

undoubtedly the oldest of the four Old Norse lays in question, it would more than any other of the lays tend to reveal the older status of vowel alliteration in North Germanic? If we average the correct percentages in the four Eddic lays we find the result to be 21.8 per cent. The correct percentages for text identical vowels are, therefore: *Béowulf* 24; *Héliand* 36 and the *Edda* 22, which does not, however, contradict the author's assumption that the percentage of text identical vowels should be lower in poems orally transmitted (*Edda*) than in first-hand compositions such as *Béowulf* or the *Héliand*. But there are many things to be taken into consideration which may invalidate this assumption. Oral transmission may not be the only factor tending to lower the percentage of text identical vowels. First, the age of the poem in question must be taken into consideration, for the younger the poem the greater would be the tendency to deviate from the original system of vowel alliteration by virtue of the greater tendency to phonetic change on the part of the vowels. The four Old Norse lays in question represent a fairly synchronous phonetic state of affairs. The *Vølundarkviða* *Hyndluljóð* and *Hymiskviða* may all safely be put in the tenth century, while only the *Þrymskviða* could possibly be as old as either the *Héliand* or *Béowulf*. The phonetic changes in O.N. would, therefore, tend to become greater than in *Béowulf* or the *Héliand* by mere virtue of time, and oral transmission is not the only factor tending to reduce the percentage of text identical vowels. Furthermore, not only the question of time but also that of the phonetic peculiarity of the individual dialects must be taken into account. Phonetic changes take place much more rapidly and extensively in one language than in another. This is particularly true of Old Saxon on the one hand, and Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse on the other. Old Saxon vowels stand in phonetic identity much nearer to their primitive status in West Germanic than do the Anglo-Saxon vowels. In Anglo-Saxon, vowel-breaking, palatalization, etc., show a vowel sensitiveness which would naturally produce a much wider gap between the text vowel and its historical derivative (either the P.G.

or the W.G.) than is the case in Anglo-Saxon, and the same is true of Old Norse with reference to Old Saxon. A glance at the percentages for text identical vowels shows us that the *Héliand* (36 per cent.) actually has a higher percentage than either *Béowulf* (24 per cent.) or the *Edda* (22 per cent.). We might, therefore, assume this to be due to the fact that the Old Saxon vowels were less liable to phonetic change than either the Anglo-Saxon or Old Norse vowels. At any rate, this is a very important factor in connection with the percentage of text identical vowels. The author's assumption with regard to oral transmission may be entirely invalidated by these two other factors; namely, that of time and that of the phonetic peculiarities of the individual dialects.

It is to be regretted that the author's investigations in Old Norse were not more extensive, since the paucity of material examined in that dialect would hardly justify a comparison with either *Béowulf* or the *Héliand*. The total number of lines examined in Old Norse is only 635, as compared with 1,379 in the *Héliand*, and the whole (3,182 lines) of *Béowulf*.

Omissions of lines which should occur under two heads are quite frequent. If a line should occur under two heads, the omission of this line under one head will not affect the percentage in question, inasmuch as the line must then be both added and subtracted from the total number of lines. But such an omission mars the form of the author's work and lessens the confidence in his general exactness. The following omissions have been noted:

Lines occurring under two heads, recorded under one head but omitted under another head:

*Béowulf*. I. Recorded in Ib but omitted in IIIb: ll. 2248, 2498, 3049, 3135.

*Héliand*. I. Recorded in Ib but omitted in IIIb: l. 297.

*Prýmskviða*. I. Recorded in Ia but omitted in IIIa: ll. 6,1; 6,3; 9,1; 10,1; 13,2; 20,2; 26,1; 26,3; 29,5.

Misprints are very rare throughout the work. Only the following has been noted: *Héliand* (p. 68), l. 261,  $i < i \ a < a \ a < a$  should read  $i < i \ e < a \ a < a$ .—On page 75 the author has

classified l. 15,4 of the *Hyndluljóð* under IIIa. This line reads as follows:

*ólu ok q'ttu átján sunu* ( $\acute{o} < \bar{o} \ q' < ai \ á < a$ ), which obviously does not show identical vowels in all members when traced back but only in two members (including the *Hauptstab*) and should, therefore, be classified under IIIb.

The results of the author's investigations tend to strengthen considerably the vowel-identity theory. In all texts examined the high percentage of vowels both identical in the text and when traced back, as well as the high percentage of approximately identical vowels, could hardly be the result of mere accident. It is to be regretted that the author's use of terms has been so inexact and loose. His methods of deriving percentages could also have been made clearer. But the work has involved an enormous amount of labor and we may feel grateful to the author for having undertaken such a laborious task. Kock's theory of vowel identity has not been established, but it has at least been tried and in so far as it has been applied it has done all that was expected of it.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

## FRENCH TEXT BOOKS

*Eugénie Grandet* by Honoré de Balzac, abridged and edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary, by A. G. H. SPIERS. Boston, Heath, 1914. xv + 236 pp.

*Tartarin de Tarascon* par Alphonse Daudet, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary, by BARRY CERF. Boston, Ginn, 1914. xxx + 204 pp.

*Chez Nous*, A French First Reader, with practical hints on syntax and idiom, by HENRI CHARLES-ÉDOUARD DAVID. New York, Holt, 1914. ix + 393 pp.

Our enterprising publishers and editors continue adding new French texts to the already considerable stock on hand with a zeal that is

commendable, since the quantity does not seem to interfere with the quality of the output. It is even a matter for congratulation that the editions of late years show a marked improvement over their predecessors of pioneer days.

In his introduction, Mr. Spiers gives the main facts of the author's career together with an estimate of his character and talent which is on the whole fair. One or two statements might, however, be challenged on the score of accuracy or completeness. Thus, when Faguet is quoted to the effect that Balzac's men and women "have the characters that suit their stations and their temperaments, the habits of their characters, the ideas of their habits, the speech of their ideas, and the acts of their speech," we have only part of the critic's judgment, and an exaggerated idea of the perfection of the novelist's art. Not all the character studies of the *Comédie humaine* attain the degree of excellence possessed by the outstanding creations. Balzac was unsurpassedly great in depicting elemental natures, overwhelming passions, commonplace people, and their surroundings. For this reason, the protagonists of his stories, chosen because of some dominant trait or passion, are as a rule superior to his subordinate personages. Where surroundings, education, occupation or necessity give the initial impulse a chance to exercise its activities to the fullest extent (Grandet, Goriot, Pons), the author is in his element, and the picture assumes grandiose proportions in its terrible reality. Where, on the other hand, circumstances are less favorable for the complete development of the innate forces, where angles have to be softened, and tones subdued, the result is far less satisfactory. The flower of society, male or female, he has not well portrayed. To quote the editor's authority, "les personnages de pure fantaisie et de la fantaisie la plus puérile heurtent dans ses ouvrages les personnages d'une vérité absolue." (Faguet, *Balzac*, in *Etudes sur le dix-neuvième siècle*, p. 438.) The conversations of refined people are characterized as stupid, and Parisians behave as "charretiers en liesse" (*Ibid.*, p. 414). His *grandes dames*, his young ladies of good society, his great ar-

tists are often falsely drawn. He is true to life in delineating "les gens de basse ou de moyenne classe", but "pour les hommes des classes supérieures . . . son information est trop restreinte, sa vue trop courte ou son induction trop hasardeuse" (*Ibid.*, p. 426). In the novel under consideration, the least well-drawn personages are Charles, the aristocratic Madame d'Aubriion and her daughter, who all are in some respects shockingly unreal, at any rate untypical of the better French society.

Further, can it be truly said that Molière becomes often tragical? In *Georges Dandin*, *le Misanthrope*, *Don Juan*, *le Malade imaginaire*, there is no doubt an undercurrent of seriousness, or even sadness and pessimism, but they remain comedies nevertheless, and the element of fun is predominant. The most one can say is *que ce serait à faire pleurer si ce n'était si drôle*. Satirical comedy feeds on vice and foible, and in as far as these can be considered as life's tragedies, in just so far may we speak of tragedy where Molière is concerned. Viewed philosophically, they lend to laughter rather than to tears.

The notes and vocabulary are accurate and to the point. Irrelevant matters have been generally avoided, the editor's object being to elucidate the text with the fewest possible words. This desire for brevity has led him occasionally to resort to the use of American slang of a questionable kind. Besides being open to objections on the part of Englishmen who might wish to use an otherwise good edition, the practice is of doubtful propriety also for the reason that American students are only too partial to such unliterary short cuts. *Faisons les mises* (23.6) is correctly translated by 'let us put up the stakes'. There was hardly need to add 'ante up' which is poker slang, the ante being different from the general *mise*. If a familiar term were thought useful, why not say 'let us come in', which is generally understood and is the exact equivalent of the French expression. *Votre serviteur* (33.3), implying refusal of a request or proposal, is adequately rendered; but the editor adduces the Americanisms 'nothing doing' (why not nothin' doin'?) and 'good



night'. Would it not have been more appropriate simply to instance the perfectly good 'excuse me', or 'I beg to be excused', which stand a better chance of being of a less ephemeral character? This objectionable 'nothing doing' is used again, together with 'no go' to translate *bernique* (105.6) which means 'it's all off' or 'all up' as the case may be. On page 111, note 3, *fichtre!* is rendered by 'gosh hang it!', as choice as the other specimens quoted. *Fichtre!* ('the deuce', 'the dickens', 'upon my word') is used by cultured Frenchmen with about the same force as *diable* or *ma parole d'honneur*, but 'gosh hang it!' can hardly claim the same social privilege either in America or in England. Even 'gee!' is called in for illustration (103.4), regardless of the probability that ten years hence such expletives will appear quite puzzling to the studious youths. In view of the above, one wonders why the editor did not translate *je les ai tous attrapés* (64.4) by 'I fooled them all', which seems, despite its triviality, to strike the right shade more exactly than 'I've got ahead of them all.'

The following further suggestions are offered for what they may be worth:

6, l. 21. Attention should be called to the fact that *pour qu'ils le fournissent de légumes* means habitual providing, not implied in the otherwise synonymous *pour qu'ils lui fournissent des légumes*.—About *chaises*, 6.5, it is stated that there are no pews in Catholic churches, a rule to which there are many exceptions. But notables like the Grandets have their own upholstered chairs for the care and placing of which they pay a yearly rental instead of the weekly two sous.—7, l. 16. A note should certainly explain that *cinq pieds*, Grandet's height, means in reality ten centimeters more than five feet, the French foot measuring 0.<sup>m</sup> 324, the English only 0.<sup>m</sup> 304. This makes him a man of medium height.—23.2. *neuf-s-heures* is not, I imagine, meant as "an imitation of the uneducated speech which inserts an *s* by analogy with the voiced spirant in *deux*, *trois*, *six*, *dix*, and *onze heures*", for in that case Balzac would have written *neuve-z-heures*, or something to that effect. It is, I believe, rather

intended as a wretched pun, still occasionally heard, namely, *neuf sœurs*.—37, l. 18. *Elle avait une tête énorme*. The vocabulary renders *énorme* by 'enormous', which is not quite the same here. Eugénie could not have resembled the Venus of Milo with an enormous head.—37.6. *le lointain des lacs tranquilles* is too freely translated by 'the calm distant lakes'. The French means that the horizon is distant, while the lakes may be lying at the beholder's feet.—60.1. *litanies* might well be rendered here by 'rigmarole'.—62.4. *pleure comme une Madeleine, que c'est une vraie bénédiction*. Two points may be noted here. Mr. Spiers translates *que c'est une vraie bénédiction* by 'it does one good to see it'. But that idea is not contained in *bénédiction* as used in the present instance, the notion of blessing being far from the maid's mind. The expression means simply 'abundantly', 'to overflowing'. A man who is beaten mercilessly might say *les coups tombaient dru que c'était une vraie bénédiction*. As to the connective *que* said to be loose and "used thus only in slovenly speech", I feel inclined to think that the condemnation is unduly harsh. To be sure, it is not considered exactly elegant to omit *tellement*, *à telles enseignes*, etc., in such a phrase, yet, in everyday conversation, this omission is tolerated; e. g., *ils se disputaient que c'était une honte*, a perfectly acceptable sentence.—82.7. *l'insulaire*, 'the islander'. The note suggests: perhaps a Britisher. It is really hard to know what Balzac did mean. *Insulaire* is also a slang term for *concierge*, and it is as conceivable that the elegant Charles had borrowed a sum of money from his janitor to pay a gambling debt as that he should have left the city without first settling what is generally considered *une dette d'honneur*.—91, l. 6. *le primevère*. It might be noted that this masculine is archaic and now rarely used, while *la primevère*, 'primrose', is, of course, common.—92, l. 16. *fuyardes journées* is rather unusual for *fuyantes* or *fugitives journées*.—103, ll. 6-7. *Tu n'as jamais tant parlé. Cependant tu n'as pas mangé de pain trempé dans du vin, je pense*. In none of the editions (Berthon, Bergeron, Spiers) have I found mention of the evident

reference to Molière's *Médecin malgré lui* where Sganarelle prescribes bread soaked in wine as a cure for the pretended muteness of his patient. At the same time it is doubtful that the idea was original with the dramatist and it is probable that long before his day the French had discovered *que le vin délie la langue*.—107, ll. 23-27. Either Grandet or Balzac is off on his figures, for it is hard to see how 6,000 francs could bring in annually 400 francs even if the government 3 per cent could be bought at 60.—*Grouillant*, 108, l. 5, is translated in the vocabulary by 'stir', 'bestir.' Is not the English 'grub' the exact equivalent etymologically and semasiologically?—127.1. The form *timère* is explained as "perhaps due to the analogy of *petit père*"; the explanation is correct, and children pronounce *tipère* and *timère*. There is, however, no need of looking for a possible connection with *mon petit*, a masculine term of endearment which, the editor states, the French frequently apply to an essentially feminine being; for it should be stated that this is about as elegant as the English "old sport" applied to a girl. Historically, *timère* antedates by far the objectionable *mon petit*.—131, l. 24. *C'est dit, c'est dit, s'écria Grandet en prenant la main de sa fille et y frappant avec la sienne*. It should be stated that this striking in the hand signifies the sealing of a bargain.—142.4. The Dreux-Brézé family was well known to the public about the first quarter of the nineteenth century, but the story of how they came by the second part of their name is surely of less interest than the circumstance that one of them who, as master of ceremonies under Louis XVI, conveyed to the Third Estate the King's order to disband, drew from Mirabeau the ringing reply: "Allez dire à votre maître que nous sommes ici par la volonté du peuple et que nous n'en sortirons que par la force des baïonnettes".—147.1. *mariage de convenance* is made sufficiently clear by 'marriage of convenience': the additional explanation 'of suitability' may be confusing, for such matches are frequently very unsuitable.—157, l. 21. *Nous nous poussons déjà. Se pousser* is cor-

rectly translated in 156.1 by 'help one another'. Here, however, it is used by Bonfons ironically with the meaning 'push out'.

Vocabulary and notes lack *fortune liquide* (4, l. 1), *cheveux-de-Vénus* (119, l. 32), and *cerner* (138, l. 13). *Métairie* (4, l. 7) translated by 'farm', and often loosely so used, is, strictly speaking, a farm worked on shares.<sup>1</sup>

*Tartarin de Tarascon* is firstly the foremost French specimen of sustained humor in the nineteenth century, secondly an admirable sample of what might be termed an *aimable causerie*, and thirdly, together with the *Lettres de mon moulin*, the best product of one of Daudet's characteristic moods.

The editor has brought all this out in his introduction, which is a sympathetic and, for the purpose, sufficiently comprehensive study of the author and his writings. It is therefore all the more astonishing that precisely in a book of the nature of *Tartarin*, Mr. Cerf should make the statement: "Sadness is the prevailing tone of his work, the sort of sadness that proceeds from pity. Where sadness does not dominate Daudet, irony takes its place." And yet Daudet has been so often compared to Dickens that to do so again would be commonplace. If Mr. Cerf tactfully and wisely refrains from making that comparison, he should not, however, overlook the literary kinship, and call Daudet an out-and-out pessimist. In his works tears and smiles mingle as they do in life itself, wherefore he is the true realist and one of the most satisfying of all modern fiction writers. It is true that there is tragedy in many of his stories, as there is in those of Dickens, but in spite of this one cannot help feeling that beneath it all there is the kindly optimism of the man, perhaps sobered by age or suffering, but real nevertheless.

The vocabulary is complete and accurate. The explanatory apparatus looks somewhat

<sup>1</sup> Misprints: 4, l. 29. *menaient*.—29, l. 7. *tiendras*.—135, l. 31. *fut*.—138, l. 32. *veut*.—154, l. 21. *galant*. The following pages contain each one or more words with dropped or broken type: 67, 79, 88, 90, 94, 118, 131, 137, 139, 193.

formidable, and one wonders whether the class of readers for whom the edition is intended will have the time or the inclination to consult it all, for to do so would inevitably interfere with the enjoyment of the story. Some pages of thirty-two and thirty-three lines contain as many as eighteen notes. One might well question the propriety of putting a masterpiece of the worth of *Tartarin* in the hands of students who are in need of all this help. Whatever opinion one may hold on that point, certain it is that much of what appears as notes might have been relegated to the vocabulary, where it could be consulted more conveniently if needed. Some might well have been omitted altogether. Items like 5.3 *me direz-vous*, 'you (reader) will say to me (author)'. 5.7 *en pleine campagne*, 'into the open country', 3.19 *midi*, 'midday', 'noon', 'South', 'Latin *media dies*', 7.18 *les lui faire chanter*, 'to make him sing them', *faire chanter à Tartarin*, 'to make T. sing', 'to make him sing', 51.14 *en se levant*, 'as she rose', 91.16 *monta encore*, 'ascended still higher'—to quote only a few—are of doubtful usefulness among the notes, which they make unnecessarily bulky. The chief concern of the editor has evidently been, not merely to solve difficulties, but to leave nothing unexplained. The foregoing remark is intended less as a criticism for Mr. Cerf, who has done his work with the most painstaking care, than as an advice to young colleagues who contemplate editing texts, and who should remember that an annotated edition is not a poney. How well the present editor has acquitted himself of his task is proven by the careful way he has cleared up geographic, ethnographic, and dialectic matters, all of which means a considerable amount of labor. And all of it is good. Since, however, the average American student does not know what a league is, it might have been well to state that the word *lieue*, 4.8, is now generally used to designate an hour's walk (in France four kilometers, in Belgium five); that a *receveur de l'enregistrement* also collects certain taxes, and not merely registers deeds; that the French word *club*, 7.21, was used in revolutionary

times to designate a society which was by no means interested in sport, and that the ungrammatical *t* in *si j'étais-t-invisible*, 6.24, is not inserted to avoid hiatus, but merely through analogy with the third person. The populace is not necessarily averse to hiatus, and will say unhesitatingly: *J'ai pa encore vu aujourd'hui*. Incidentally such a mistake is called a *pataquès*. A *warren rabbit*, 10.13, is rather known in English-speaking countries by the name of *wild rabbit*. A *salade russe*, 56.22, served with a twenty-five-cent dinner in the Latin Quarter, contains no fish, but merely beans, carrots, cauliflower and perhaps some other vegetable. The word *rentier*, translated in the vocabulary by 'capitalist', 'gentleman', is indeed difficult to render. The English use the term 'gentleman of leisure'; the Americans, 'man living on his income', 'retired', etc.

Printing and proof-reading have been done most carefully: only one misprint has been noted: 2, l. 5, *arbo*s for *arbor*; the same in the note.

---

Mr. David's Reader was inspired by Mr. Allen's German Readers *Herein* and *Daheim*, but these were, as the author tells us in his preface, "the starting-point rather than the models" of *Chez Nous*. A casual perusal soon convinces us that such must indeed have been the case, for *Chez Nous* is French to the core, and good French at that. It is made up of a number of sketches, stories, songs, fables, dialogues, and even a "Pièce à grand spectacle en 2 actes et 6 tableaux avec un prologue." A considerable amount of it is autobiographical, the author having drawn extensively on his reminiscences of Paris school days. This lends a remarkable freshness and life to this very original reader. A number of childish songs, popular all over France, "Au clair de la lune", "Nous n'irons plus au bois", "Fais dodo Nicolas", "Frère Jacques", etc., are included, together with their melodies, and piano accompaniments. The Reader is also supplied with copious helps for learner and teacher. Besides a complete vocabulary, there is a chapter entitled "Expressions", in which the idiomatic



phrases contained in each piece are noted and arranged for study or review, a chapter of questions, a considerable body of notes, a section on conditional sentences, one on the use of the subjunctive, three pages on the use of the indefinite pronoun *on*, thirty-seven pages on the use of the various prepositions, and eight on the infinitive after the verb. The parts dealing with grammar and idiom are all based on the text, which furnishes the necessary illustrative examples. In other words, the text is used to give what amounts to a complete course in grammar and syntax, scattered in notes and appendices. The foregoing is sufficient to show that the author's claim to produce "not only a reader, but at the same time a drill-book and a reference book" is well substantiated. From the nature of the reading material it is evidently intended for very young pupils, but it could equally well serve the needs of students who prepare for the teaching profession. They alone could make profitable use of the very extensive pedagogical apparatus that accompanies the reading matter. The grammatical part is often worded in a far too scientific and sometimes vague manner to be within the grasp of the childish mind. Even more mature students and teachers will need to consult a grammar in order to complete the general and partial statements of the author. Space forbids going into a detailed discussion; but, to mention only the treatment of the subjunctive, it seems to me to be lacking in clearness and simplicity. Beginners, even of a more advanced age, need three or four definite rules: First, subjunctive after verbs of volition and emotion; second, after impersonal expressions not implying truth, certainty or probability; third, after conjunctive expressions; fourth, in relative, so-called characteristic clauses, where there is doubt, and after *le premier*, *le seul*, etc. Such rules stick in the learner's mind. The most important exceptions should of course be indicated with the rules, which can be completed at a later stage. By making the numerous divisions Mr. David adopts, noun clauses, adjective clauses, adverb clauses, each with three, four, or even seven subdivisions, the matter becomes a bugbear to

young pupils, and the result is apt to be disappointing. In all other respects the book is first-rate, and may be safely recommended. The material execution, printing, proof-reading, binding, is of the best.

J. L. BORGERHOFF.

Western Reserve University.

---

*Selections from Mesonero Romanos.* Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1913. 12mo., pp. xxiv + 188 (Text 1-81). Portrait.

The Spanish essay of manners is a distinctive product. However much it may owe to De Jouy or *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*, it has a flavor of the soil when it gets into the hands of the genial Mesonero, the sarcastic Larra, or the Andalusian Estébanez Calderón. Professor Northup has taken the first step toward opening this field to the American student in his selections from Mesonero Romanos. The work is scholarly,—satisfactory in every particular. While the reviewer cannot speak from the view-point of one who has put his victim to the supreme test of class-room use, he may essay the welcome task of giving an account of impressions gained from reading the book before us.

Larra's style may be more vigorous, and Estébanez, in a sense, more "Spanish," but we feel readier sympathy for Mr. Northup's task as editor of Mesonero than we should have felt if he had limited himself to either of the other *costumbristas*. Genial, wholesome, patriotic, broad of view, hopeful,—these characteristics come spontaneously to the mind of one who has read the *Recollections of a Septuagenarian*, of whom our editor has given his readers a pleasing and accurate account in his introduction, accompanied by a well-known portrait. We see him as boy, soldier, author, patriot, reformer, doing "more for the material and intellectual development of Madrid than any other Span-

iard of the nineteenth century" (p. xvii). Any man could wish to merit the verdict: "Sanity is his dominant characteristic" (p. xxi). The introduction is followed by a useful "Bibliographical Note."

No two critics would agree in the selection of a limited number of essays from so vast a field. One would guess that Mr. Northup's edition—by the way the book has no table of contents—includes *La casa de Cervantes* and *El retrato* for literary reasons rather than for interest; *La empleo-manía*, *El alquiler de un cuarto* and *Tengo lo que me basta* would be ascribed to the "Spanish atmosphere"; one might also wonder if there were not more interesting articles than *El barbero de Madrid*. As possible substitutes for some of these the reviewer would suggest *Un viaje al sitio* or *El día treinta del mes* (from the *Panorama matritense*), or perhaps *Una noche de vela* (from the *Escenas matritenses*). Nobody would wish that Mr. Northup had omitted *El amante corto de vista*, nor the choice skit on *Romantics and Romanticism* which shows Mesonero at his best and gives us a breath of contemporaneous literary atmosphere as well. From this last the editor has omitted a scabrous episode. Another omission, which he has failed to record, is that of the verse headings to the various essays,—an interesting little mannerism of the day which may have been due to Sir Walter Scott. The reviewer's tolerant eye has observed no misprints in the text.

The notes are illuminating and sagacious, though perhaps none too numerous. The insight evidenced in clearing up the author's mistake about Orbaneja de Úbeda (6:15) is typical of the excellent comment found here. One might make a few suggestions:

The translation of *duodécimo* (9:3) as "trumpery" (i. e., "miserable little") might not be clear to any but quick-witted students. The word appears only as "twelfth" in the vocabulary.

*Dulcinea de Toboso* (30:20) should read *del Toboso* (*Quixote*, I., xxvi).

On page 97 (note to p. 33, line 20) we find others "claim that it did not fall," an unde-

sirable use of the Americanism *claim* for *maintain*. The use of *apogee* on the same page (note 34:1) for the more usual *zenith* is striking.

The note on *Isla* (40:7) is awkwardly worded.

Some may criticize the note on romanticism (51:3) because of its length, but it is really necessary to a complete understanding of the important essay in which the word occurs, and it is very well done. It hardly seems wise, however, to explain any of Byron's influence by the "glowing descriptions of Spain in *Childe Harold*": Byron was much more influential in France (without any such special cause), much of *Childe Harold* is insulting to Spaniards, and the poem was not at all conspicuous among the early versions of Byron's works. It would have added literary interest to point out how Mesonero's burlesque romantic tragedy satirizes the novelties of the genre, such as violation of the classical unities and rejection of fixed verse forms. Possibly some parallels to *Hernani* or *Don Alvaro* might have been established.

Further minor suggestions follow: *Maldita la gana tengo de ello* (26:15) is well worth a note.—The same might be said of the position of the adjective in *las civiles guerras* (33:24).—In speaking of Felipe II (34:12) it would have been well to add a word about *sus dos sucesores*. Has not the editor also failed to explain Carlos III and the sinister Fernando VII (35:17)?—In connection with Cervantes, something might have been said about the "sangre derramada en los combates" and the "ánimo esforzado en las prisiones" (page 37).—*Había de llevar* (42:11) is worth mention as a peculiar construction, infinitive with conditional flavor.—To call Balzac "one of the most famous of French novelists" (56:30) is almost too mild a statement.—On page 71, line 20, occurs the expression *en toda su vida*, for which we find in the notes the correct negative translation and nothing more. Unless explained, this is likely to puzzle the reader.

The vocabulary is strikingly apt and complete, so far as a few test pages can indicate. Possibly a class might root out an omission or

two for the delight of a more microscopic reviewer. The following words seem deserving of fuller treatment, or else of a special note:

*Hallarse con*: cf. p. 18, l. 9, "se hallaba con que se había ofrecido."

*Llevar* should be translated "bring," in order to fit the use on p. 23, l. 25.

*Contigo* (24:10) seems meaningless if translated "with you" (*sic* vocab.).

*Pundonor* (25:3) is hardly "point of honor" so much as "sense of honor."

*El de más allá* (42:17) does not seem clear from the vocabulary meanings of *más allá* ("farther on," "beyond").

*Arreglar el pozo* (43:28) will be translated as "arrange the well," if the vocabulary be followed. One suspects another meaning.

*Convenir* is given only as an active verb with the conventional meanings. This hardly seems to fit *la señora que se convenía á todo* (50:6).

The reviewer takes the liberty of adding one or two suggestions, without any insinuation that the implied omissions are culpable. (1) The reference to Maiquez (page 40, line 12) would not have been damaged by mentioning Cotarelo y Mori's interesting book, *Isidoro Maiquez y el teatro de su tiempo* (Madrid, 1902). (2) It may add interest to the mention of Utrilla y Rouget, "leading tailors of the day" (54:27), to inform the reader that the former is mentioned by Mesonero himself in his *Manual*, while Rouget's name appears in the celebrated *Handbook* of Richard Ford. (3) The *figuras de capuz* and *siniestros bultos* of page 57, line 13, may take on particular significance from the fact that, two or three years before the date of the essay in which the expressions occur, Escosura had published in *El Artista* a semi-romantic legend entitled *El bulto vestido del negro capuz* (Cf. also Espronceda, *Obras* 1884, page 55). (4) *Perfectibilidad social* (77:29) evidently refers to ideas prevailing in France in the eighteenth century, with which Mesonero would have had scant sympathy.

PHILIP H. CHURCHMAN.

Clark College.

URBAN CRONAN, *Teatro español del siglo XVI*. Tomo primero. (Sociedad de bibliófilos madrileños, X.) Madrid, 1913. 8vo., x + 547 pp.

In the past students of the early Spanish drama have been hampered seriously by the lack of available texts of the minor dramatists, but recent publications have now made accessible nearly all the dramatic material of the first half of the sixteenth century. Of the late collections, the above-mentioned volume is the most important, not only for the large amount of material it contains, but also for the importance of the texts it reproduces. The list is as follows:

*Comedia Tideia*, by Francisco de las Natas. —*Comedia Tesorina* and *Comedia Vidriana*,<sup>1</sup> by Jayme de Guete. —*Tragicomedia alegórica del parayso y del infierno*. —*Farsa*, by Fernando Diaz. —*Egloga pastoril*. —*Egloga nueva*. —*Egloga*, by Juan de Paris. —*Farsa del mundo* and *Farsa sobre la felice nueva de la concordia y paz*, by Fernan Lopez de Yanguas. —*Farsa Rosiela*. These plays, the originals of which are to be found either in the National Library at Madrid or in the Royal Library in Munich, are well known to bibliographers, but they offer an almost untouched mine for linguistic and literary study.

In praiseworthy contrast to those editors who have been content to publish works from the editions nearest at hand when older ones were known to exist, Cronan has spared no pains to give a text based on a comparison of all the extant editions of the older period. He has aimed to reproduce these with the least possible change. "Hemos conservado la ortografía de los textos originales, limitándonos á extender las abreviaturas<sup>2</sup> y subsanar las erratas evidentes." When but one old text is extant,

<sup>1</sup> In the *Romanic Review*, Vol. I (1910), p. 459, I announced that I was preparing an edition of the *Comedia Vidriana*. Although everything that pertains to the study of the text remains to be done, the play is not important enough to justify a second edition at this time.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations rarely give trouble in these texts. However, p. 503, line 284, should read, "Porque poneyes (not podeys) los dos juntos."



there are, under these principles, but two serious sources of error, mistakes in copying and erroneous emendation. In order to show the condition of the original texts, and to test the accuracy of the present edition, all the variants<sup>a</sup> (with the exception of abbreviations) of the original print of the *Comedia Vidriana* to the end of the second act (1216 lines) are here given:

On the title-page the name of the author is given as Gueta, line 49 aqustas, 59 diabra, 186 toda, 187 vexe, 222 may, 278 majedero, 281 iamas, 290 mia, 361 escuas, 501 desseal, 606 enlestabro, 619 aquin, 620 desgarrre, 660 atorgados, 732 aguda, 770 momoria, 772 escaria, 820 sufrimiento, 853 entiendo vs, 854 dientes, 883 trista, 905 bios, 1073 essarga, 1101 dexillo, 1157 ciertamente, 1165 contingo, 1184 vezas.

It is at once apparent that extraordinary liberties have been taken in emending the text without accounting for the original readings in the notes. *Enlestabro* is supported by line 302 and is probably the correct reading for 271, *aquin* is accepted in the text in line 855, the orthography of *entiendo vs* is supported by 1451 *yo vs* and the *Tesorina* 1509 *no vs*, *bios* seems to be a euphemistic form here as also in the *Tesorina* 1049, *trista* is a good Aragonese form, *mia* and *cieratamente* are found frequently, a garbled form like *momoria* in the mouth of Cetina is not surprising, and it is not at all certain that *majedero*, *escuas* and *atorgados* are misprints. The faulty readings of lines 187 and 620 are simply slips on the part of the modern editor or printer.

For the rest of this text the rejected readings of the original are given when they seem to be correct, and also within parentheses when doubtful:

1384 no son, 1399 a esta, (1408 cayga), (1411 entendio), 1451 vs, 1466 Sam, (1785 esso), (1928 seguedad), (1981 llabas), (2018 pansar), (2040 damanda), (it is safer not to correct the speech of Perucho even though it reads 2083 tado, 2084 espanto, 2088 las, 2154 vas), 2165 vltraje, (2219 enxabonarras), 2286 dessa, 2368 rinña (if linñaje is to stand in 2168),

(2445 pesera), (2460 offenderora), 2780 (y ya, 2874 o que afan.

In the case of the *Tesorina* there are two existing texts. Cronan evidently chose the Madrid print as the basis for his edition, but he did not follow it as rigidly as he should. This text has several points in its favor: It is apparently about fifteen years older than the Munich print, and comes from the same press as the *Comedia Vidriana*; it also contains more rare dialect forms. The Munich print shows no emendations that indicate corrections of the author, but popular forms have frequently been rejected in favor of the more current literary ones. It is almost certain that these changes are due to the misguided efforts of a well-meaning printer. The readings of the 1551 text can scarcely have other value than that they represent the opinion of a Spaniard who was practically contemporary with the author. It is a serious error on Cronan's part to accept readings from the reprint when the earlier text could be shown to be correct.

In the following list the forms of the Madrid print are given that should, in the opinion of the reviewer, be restored to the text. The forms in parentheses are doubtful, and perhaps not always worth noting, but as they frequently show tendencies in similar directions, it seems rather unsafe to classify them as misprints:

Line 27 amostro, 53 parecen, 58 ellotro (similar emendation in 232, but compare 947 enell ayre, 1191 and 2373 ell ombre), 77 terciopedo (intentional blunder), 116 aga, 127 desfregada, 141 vng moço con vng galan, 206 seuchara, 232 ellaltura, 241 quijeres (see below, 950 and 2278), 245 fundamiento, 339 ven, 417 qualquiere (cf. 2236), 448 mal, 451 otro, (495 the emendation is not convincing), 501 has, 521 mulata, 619 adiutoriz?, 692 vez (cf. 963), 709 vna, 723 ahos (cf. 132, 144, etc.), 742 Amnon, 747 v Orphee (= u, cf. 2165), (748 y phio), 794 en, 805 pues que Dios te, 832 calor, 845 lignage, 888 sentemiento, 907 trista, 913 cocez, 917 aguardas, 919 entra, 950 quigesse, 963 vezte, 979 trizte, 989 drento (cf. *Vidriana* 818), (997 paraceiz), 1031 huavs, 1033 en layre, 1049 bios, 1059 echeis (the emended form is of course what one would expect here), (1104 embidio, but cf. 1378), 1192 hablabais, (1221 mosorrabes), 1245 las bispas, (1257 sabacos), 1280 virgam (Gilyracho's

<sup>a</sup> The variants cited have been taken from my own copies, but to insure reasonable accuracy, they have been compared anew with the original texts.

Latin may not be above reproach), (1309 entoces . . . quion), 1342 ni, 1437 hablaredes, (1449 cendero), 1454 vees, (1458 que lo que), 1509 no vs, 1543 en llespial, 1576 allega, (1762 guerta), (1797 Salamon), 1848 reprhende, 1876 desta, 1881 callademente, 1887 azia a, 1896 hartaua, (1905 tenos), 1920 sallida, 1988 jodio (cf. 2440), 2031 Palblo (intentional?), (2037 rason), 2039 andemos, 2054 araña, 2165 v otra, 2230 xallia, 2231 xtar, 2236 qualquiere, 2243 pidiras, 2250 a dalguna . . . phro, 2267 vex, 2269 xinora, 2278 quigeras, 2440 jodio, 2484 vubon?, 2513 sallia, 2519 sallir, 2635 sallid, 2652 Fin.

The variants of the *Vidriana* and the *Tesorina* are sufficient to show the merits as well as the defects of Cronan's work. The care with which he has performed the heavy task of copying, preparing for the printer, and reading the proof of eleven plays, four of them in two editions, deserves only the highest praise. If the amount of material that he handled were not so great, he might be criticised more severely for rejecting so many forms that are capable of justification. However, it would take years to make a critical text, and to explain the difficult passages of the plays that are found in this volume alone. Such a critical text being out of the question, the all-important thing is to have an accurate reproduction of the original. One might even admit that it is permissible to correct without mention certain classes of misprints. In the Gothic type it was easy to confuse such letters as the long *s* with *f* or *n* with *u*, and it does seem pedantic to crowd the variants with such forms as *pnes* for *pues* and *foy* for *soy*. But when, in his effort to make a readable text, the editor emends without mention in the notes dialect forms that can be proven to be correct, or even those that have the slightest chance of justification, the result is that his work is robbed of much of its value for linguistic study. Until more is known of the popular language of the sixteenth century, the safer way will be to give all the readings of the principal edition at least, even at the risk of appearing pedantic.

Two other plays of the volume under review have been compared with the originals without finding material that would modify the opinions expressed above. It is important to note,

however, that the earliest edition of Fernan Lopez de Yanguas' *Farsa del mundo* was overlooked. This text, which dates from 1524, has been described in the catalogues of the libraries of Salvá (No. 1300) and Heredia (No. 2312), and attention has been called to it more recently by Kohler, *Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen*, 1911, p. 150. Both the 1528 and the 1551-editions appear to be copies of the earlier edition. Cronan's text, although based on the later prints, is not at all unsatisfactory.

Of the remaining texts four had already appeared in the above-mentioned volume of Kohler. Cronan's text of the *Egloga* of Juan de Paris is the better, in that it is based on the 1536 edition with variants of that of 1551, while Kohler used only the later text. The *Farsa* of Fernando Diaz, the *Egloga pastoril*, and the *Egloga nueva* were reprinted by both editors from the old editions now found in the Royal Library at Munich. While both editions are undoubtedly excellent, those who are engaged in linguistic study will prefer Kohler, because he gives in the foot-notes the original readings corresponding to his emendations.

RALPH E. HOUSE.

University of Chicago.

#### *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser.*

Edited with critical notes by J. C. SMITH and E. DE SÉLINCOURT, with an introduction by E. DE SÉLINCOURT and a glossary. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1912. Small 8vo. Pp. lxxvii + 736.

The student of Spenser has still to await a single-volume edition which quite supersedes others. Though this Oxford concise Spenser, in view of its tasteful critical introduction, its inclusion of the Spenser-Harvey letters,<sup>1</sup> its facsimile title-pages, and its woodcuts from *The Shepheardes Calendar*, offers the greatest inducements for the least money, yet the Globe

<sup>1</sup> Apparently by afterthought, since the editor (p. xxi, n. 2) refers to them as quoted in Grosart.

edition remains unique in offering the *View of Ireland* and best in biography (by the late J. W. Hales), while R. E. Neil Dodge's edition must be had for the 1590 text of the *Faerie Queene* and the list of characters therein. No edition since Todd (1805) contains an adequate body of notes.

The present text leaves little to be desired in accurate reproduction of words and spelling, following as it does the larger Oxford edition with partial correction of errors noted (see *Anglia Beiblatt*, XXII, 41 f.; *Englische Studien*, 44, 260 f.). In *Daphnaida* the prefatory letter is still needlessly that of 1596, because the British Museum copy of 1591 chanced to lack the letter. There is also considerable laxity in punctuation. Thus the sonnet to Harvey contains thirteen unnoted deviations and five tacit omissions of capitals (out of eight), according to the copy B. M. c. 40, d. 14, p. 75. Salutation and signature offer three more. Less excuse appears in *Astrophel*, ll. 14, 116, 170, 182, 194, 200,—all of which have a colon in B. M. 11536, and should have, because Spenser regularly so punctuates the second line of his six-line stanzas, as usually also the second line of the *Amoretti*.

The critical appendix singularly omits (p. 656) a note on *M. H. T.* 629, where the 1609 folio reads *he*, paralleling *R. T.* 447 and making it clear that the reigning sovereign is intended. The editor's experience with regard to *Mother Hubberds Tale*, of encountering folios dated only 1611 or 1612, is peculiar. The copy B. M. 78 h. 23 (like most I have seen) is dated 1613, though as usual bound in the 1611 folio of *The Faerie Queene*. A similar insouciance is encountered in the assistant's glossary, where William Alabaster, secretary of the Earl of Essex, figures as a pseudonym. So Amaryllis is 'a shepherdess,' though her sister Phyllis is rightly a pseudonym. Colin and Hobbinoll are omitted. *Astrophel*, despite warning (*N. Y. Nation*, 1910, Index, *Astrophel*) is entered as a botanical term. In fact the pseudonyms appear to be confined to those which occur in *Colin Clout*. Thus Meliboeus and Pastorella are omitted, and Aleyon and Daphne not referred to *Daphnaida*. Yet from the *Calendar*

Algrind is included, and not Dido. Equally the general principle of the glossary is not clear: it includes words referred only to Harvey (*agent*), and words obvious to the reader (*ambushment*, *dromedare*). It is, nevertheless, clear and full.

The hand of Sélincourt in this volume appears mainly in the introduction, which consists of two very unequal parts,—an inaccurate and ill-informed biography to which that by Hales remains superior, and a tasteful, timely appreciation of Spenser's poetry. For example, it ignores Gollancz's discovery that Spenser was secretary of Bishop Young; it repeats without reserve the discredited theory of Spenser's being associated with Lancashire. To make a test case of the first page: the lines quoted from the *Prothalamion* indicate that Spenser's ancestors, not necessarily his parents, were not Londoners. The identification of his father as John Spenser, here advanced without question, was never widely received and was withdrawn by its proposer, Grosart (see *The Spending of the Money of Robert Nowell*, p. xx). That Spenser was born in East Smithfield is a late and tenuous tradition; but Sélincourt's avowal that John Spenser lived there is an undocumented inference from it. With easy credence he furnishes the poet with a brother John and sister Elizabeth, sending the brother to the poet's school and college. This offering as fact a tissue of conjecture is so typical that no serious student of Spenser will look to this account except for suggestive flashes of insight. There Sélincourt is happy, as in the hazard that Spenser appeared before the Queen as a boy actor. It is apparent throughout that the writer relies on second-hand sources even when ostensibly quoting the original. He reproduces (p. xxxviii, top) Grosart's misreadings of the manuscript, printing 'you' for 'your lordships,' inserting 'all,' and omitting 'the service of' where he reads 'in the wars.'

The pages (xl–lxvii) in explanation and appreciation of the poetry of Spenser may be commended to students as both lucid and sensible. Sélincourt is not led astray by the heresy that Spenser lacked humor—an example of the oral tradition not uncommon in modern critical



scholarship. His faults are too exclusive pre-occupation with *The Faerie Queene*, a habit of universal statement, and a failure to recognize Spenser's following of precedent. The last appears in his implying (p. lv) that the idea of a fourth grace is original, whereas it dates from Homer (*Shep. Cal.*, April, Gloss, *The Graces*, June, Gloss, *Many Graces*). Nor does he indicate that Spenser's archaism is in reality a most conservative following of classical precedent: "unde pictae vestis, et aulai, Virgilius amantissimus vetustatis, carminibus inseruit." Quinctiliani, *Instit. Orator.* lib. 1. 7.

Before concluding, a challenge (p. liii) as to the identity of Calidore must be met. J. C. Smith urges that he is, like Sidney, distinguished as a runner and a wrestler. Only one reference indicates the latter (*F. Q.* 6. 9. 43-44). But there, to the contrary, we find an expert wrestler expecting in that sport "sure t'auenge his grudge" against Calidore. The latter wins by strength. It is not stated that he was apt in the art. That Calidore is a runner, I grant. But such an accomplishment would be unseemly haste in the knights of Holiness, Temperance, and Justice. The force of the comparison is further vitiated by comparison with 'the brave courtier' (*M. H. T.* 744-6) which merely declares that an ideal courtier will, among other forms of exercise, learn to wrestle. The advice was a commonplace of courtly instruction, familiar to any reader of Castiglione. In saying that the portrait of the courtier was 'drawn from Sidney,' the writer not only flatly contradicts his general view of Spenser's character portrayal (p. li), but misconceives the obvious method of composition. The portrayal of an ideal type—of poet, orator, courtier—was in ordinary course. Writers worked from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete. This is especially obvious in a devotee to Platonic ideas.

Waiving judgment of details, the present volume is clearly the most serviceable one now available.

PERCY W. LONG.

Harvard University.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### WELLS' *Passionate Friends* AND FROMENTIN'S *Dominique*

From the outset let it be understood that I am not accusing Mr. Wells of plagiarism. My reading of *Passionate Friends* conjured up memories of a French novel of the latter half of the nineteenth century, Fromentin's *Dominique*, and upon analysing the two books I discovered that they had very much in common. I do not know whether Mr. Wells ever read the French novel. I sincerely hope he did, and if he did not, there is a fund of pleasure still in store for him.

Both novels depict the life of a man from his very earliest childhood until after he had passed through the greatest crisis of his existence and had reached the state of calm yet sad resignation. *Passionate Friends* is a document dedicated by a father to his son that he might be spared much sorrow and profit by the father's experience. The story of Fromentin is told by the man whose name the book bears to his friend, as an apology or an explanation of his present life. In detail the resemblance between the two novels is not very great, in spirit the resemblance becomes almost striking.

Dominique was introduced to the world of books and of careers by his tutor. Stephen, in *Passionate Friends*, was also under the spell of a tutor, but not so completely as Dominique, because after boyhood the tutor passed out of his life, while in the French novel the tutor acts as a father confessor to his pupil and is his friend for life. Dominique and Stephen meet the women who were to work such havoc in their lives when they are still youths at school. They are both extremely susceptible to the beauties of Nature. In *Dominique* the young woman marries a man she apparently does not love, but who is the choice of her family on account of his wealth. She does not allow him to guess her secret until all is over between them. Mary, in *Passionate Friends*, voluntarily and with a very clear purpose in mind, contracts a marriage with a man she

avowedly does not love, who is likewise wealthy, after having very frankly set forth the whole situation to her lover. The descriptions of the moods of the two men immediately after the wedding are almost identical. In *Passionate Friends* Stephen meets Mary for the first time after her marriage at a ball. There is a similar incident in *Dominique*, and a great resemblance in the portrayal of the conflicting emotions of the two men, with even such minor details as the admiration of the gowns worn by the two women, and the difficulty in realizing that these are the same young women they loved, so dazzled are they by the splendor about them.

Mary and Madeleine are two different types of women. Mary is brilliant and headstrong. Intellectually she is even the superior of Stephen. Madeleine also possesses a very strong will but she is much gentler than Mary. Both women have in common their overpowering passion mingled with a deep sensibility for the beauty of Nature. Nature in both books plays somewhat the same rôle as in Goethe's *Werther*. In *Dominique* we have no serious *exposé* of social theories as in the novel of Wells, and yet Dominique chooses a life in which he would be of greatest service to the community of which he is a member. Deeds are often better than words! Stephen marries partly at the instigation of Mary. After several years of anguish Mary puts the only possible obstacle between her and Stephen, death by suicide. Madeleine, after at last having confessed her love for Dominique (she never allowed him to learn it until now), once her secret is known, forbids Dominique to see her again and advises him to marry, saying that when he shall have forgotten her she will be either dead or happy. In *Dominique* we have a pure idyl. *Passionate Friends*, on the contrary, is an exceedingly modern book, full of intrigues and scandal; yet in spite of it all the reader is left in very much the same mood as after reading *Dominique*. That is the basis of my comparison. Both novels have a peculiarly quieting and purifying effect on the emotions. The æsthetic quality of the two novels is the same. It is this artistic, æsthetic treatment of the turbulent and

passionate theme that produces the effect just described. In music it might be compared to the *Adagio* of Beethoven's *Sonate pathétique*—sad yet sweet resignation with an occasional outburst of revolt.

HELEN J. HARVITT.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### A NOTE ON THE *Blickling Homilies*

*M[ar]pon*, as printed by R. Morris in his edition of the *Blickling Homilies*, p. 19, l. 23, has drawn the attention of several commentators. Zupitza, in his paper in the *Anzeiger für Deutsches Alterthum und Deutsche Literatur* I, 119 ff., simply says: "19, 22 (read 23!). *mar þon* entschieden unrichtig aber wie zu bessern?" Holthausen, in *Englische Studien* XIV, 393 ff., says "*þonne m[ar]þon . . . miht*. Ich schlage vor, *þonne* zu streichen und für *m—þon* das auch S. 89, 32 vorkommende *midþon þe* 'während' einzusetzen. Davor gehört aber dann auch ein komma, nicht ein semikolon, wie bei M., und hinter *miht* ein fragezeichen, denn das ganze, von *Hwæt* (z. 20) an, ist ein fragesatz." Max Förster, in a paper in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* XCI, 179 ff., says: ". . . *faran . . . ondweard = . . . de loco ad locum venire. Quia ergo in divinitate mutabilitas non est atque hoc ipsum mutari transire est, profecto ille transitus* (d. h. vor dem Blinden vorüber) *ex carne est, non ex divinitate. Per divinitatem vero ei semper stare est, quia ubique præsens. . .* Ein Wort *marþon* kennen überdies die Wörterbücher nicht. Wahrscheinlich ist zu schreiben *ne biþ on*. Das folgende ist jedenfalls verderbt: wer nicht den Ausfall einer Zeile annehmen will, könnte nach *omwendnesse* eine stärkere Interpunktion machen und statt *on carcerne* einen dem *transitus* entsprechenden Ausdruck, etwa nochmals *ondwendnesse* vermuten. Auch mit dem folgenden *miht*, welches Morris in der Übersetzung einfach ignoriert, ist so nichts anzufangen. Hiess es *of þære godcundan mihte*?" Neither of these conjectures is plausible.

ible, but Holthausen's proposal has this advantage over Förster's that it preserves the *m* of the ms., which there is no reason to reject.

I believe that the mysterious *marþon* should be read *mærþon*, and is another instance of *mærþum* 'miraculously, wondrously, gloriously.' This adverbial use of the dative plural of *mærþ(u)* is exemplified in Bosworth-Toller by two instances, taken from *Elene* and *Beowulf*. Morris translates the passage from *poune* to *gedcundan (miht)*: 'but, moreover, there was no change either of the divine nature or of the divine power in its imprisonment in the human nature.' 'Moreover' has no sense whatever in this clause; if we substitute 'miraculously' the sense is suited. If it should be objected that there is no corresponding word in the Latin text, I refer to the universal habit of the Old English translators to drop or insert words as appeared convenient to them. I agree with Holthausen that the sentence ends with *miht*, but I prefer to place a mark of interrogation after *oþerre*, and a period after *miht*. As regards the form *mærþon*, datives in *-on* are not rare in the *Blickling Homilies*: *eagon* 121, 1; *earon* 121, 2; *hæton* 59, 4; *lufon* 23, 24; *dælon* 53, 12.

A. E. H. SWAEN.

Amsterdam, Holland.

#### BRIEF MENTION

For some years it has been evident that the relations between the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* and the Goethe-Gesellschaft were becoming more or less strained. Thus no 'communication' from the Archiv was printed in either 1912 or 1913, and 1911 was also the last year that the *Festvortrag* of the *Generalversammlung* of the Society was published in the *Jahrbuch*. In 1912 the establishment of a separate official organ of the Society was resolved upon and the first volume has now appeared under the title *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft. Im Auftrage des Vorstandes herausgegeben von H. G. Gräff*, Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1914 (8vo., 225 pp.).

Comparing the new organ with the older issues of Professor Geiger's *Goethe-Jahrbuch*—the publication of which has now ceased—we

find the rubrics 'Abhandlungen' and 'Mitteilungen aus dem Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv' retained, with the difference, however, that the *Abhandlungen* in the new organ are fewer in number and are all contributed by men of note (Walzel, Seuffert, Pniower). The rubric 'Neue und alte Quellen' is practically identical in scope with the heading 'Verschiedene Mitteilungen' of the old Year-book. Added is the category 'Mitteilungen aus dem Goethe-National-Museum,' represented in the initial volume solely by an exquisite reproduction of the painting of Goethe by George Dawe, accompanied by some two pages of explanatory text, which have evidently not found the place intended for them in the volume. The old rubric 'Miscellen,' always rather scrappy in character, is dropped altogether, as is also the Bibliography, whether wisely or not is open to question. Outwardly and inwardly the distinguishing character of the new as compared with the old Annual is a certain *Vornehmheit* that accords well with Weimar traditions. Perhaps in line with this is the change from a Latin to a Fraktur type, a change which will otherwise be regretted by many foreign readers.

*Les Aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires du nord-ouest de l'Angoumois*, par A.-L. Terracher (Champion, 1914. xiv + 248 + 452 pp., and Atlas). While listing and classifying certain of the speech phenomena of a limited locality with a thoroughness and, to judge from equipment and method, a sureness difficult to excel, the author has not written a local dialect treatise in the ordinary sense. Instead, this is a fundamental study of the processes and possible causes of speech substitution, as tested in a small group of *parlers populaires*. The territory is northwest Angoumois, and the phenomena selected for observation are the inflexion systems there in use—a choice that needs no justification beyond the superior fashion in which morphological systems lend themselves to accurate observation. The geographical distribution of these phenomena is established with care, and shows for the territory covered no correspondence with physical or ecclesiastical boundaries sufficient to justify the assumption of a causal nexus. Mr. Terracher then proceeds to test the influence of speech-mixture upon the speech forms. This he does, not by means of assumptions or of specimen cases, but by positive data, and he has not hesitated before the colossal task of analyzing, for a period of one hundred years,



the individual marriage statistics of fifty communes with a population of some 40,000. The remarkably detailed and systematic study of these statistics leads to the establishment of a direct relation between the disintegration of the local speeches and the introduction of non-local elements into the community, by reason of the marriages which residents contract with outsiders. For a single village a minute examination is further made of the speech of every family and of the nature and extent of the changes wrought in families where extraneous members have been introduced. As a result of such a thoroughgoing and specific piece of work light can hardly fail to be thrown on many important questions of detail. It is definitely shown that the break-up of the old local patois is to a less extent due to the direct influence of French than to its indirect influence working through neighboring patois nearer to French than the one in process of disintegration. Of equal interest is the evidence adduced to show that the geographical distribution of extra-local marriages and of kinship in flexional forms is directly connected with the boundaries of the medieval fiefs. In all of the discussion, there is an admirable freedom from exaggeration of the element under consideration and from forgetfulness of the existence of other possible factors. It is striking that in this as in two other recent works bearing upon entirely different domains and problems—Bédier's *Légendes épiques* and Foulet's *Roman de Renard*—each author has independently of the other chosen the same path: the concentration of attention on a concrete, correlated, and accessible group of phenomena interpreted in the light of their *milieu* and *moment*. The coincidence is of no small import for the future of linguistic and literary study.

---

M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, Tomo IV, con una introducción de A. Bonilla y San Martín (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 21. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière, 1915, 8vo., 620 pp.) contains the following texts: "El Asno de Oro," de Lucio Apuleyo;—"Eurialo é Lucrecia;"—"Fabulario," de Sebastián Mey;—"Coloquios," de Erasmo;—"Coloquio de las Damas," de Pedro Aretino;—"Diálogos de Amor," de Leon Hebreo;—"El Viaje Entretenido," de Agustín de Rojas. This choice of texts is in conformity with an intention, previously expressed, of treating "especialmente del género picaresco, y tambien de otras formas novelísticas ó análogas á la novela, como los coloquios y diálogos satíricos." The

death of Menéndez Pelayo left the volume scarcely begun and the present publication is due to the devoted friend and pupil who knew of the plans of the *Maestro*. Bonilla has collated the texts on the original versions; he has supplied an authenticated critical commentary by listing such passages in Menéndez Pelayo's previous works as deal with the texts in question. Furthermore, he has added not a few notes of historical, literary, and bibliographical character, especially in connection with the *Viaje Entretenido*. In addition to the strictly editorial work, Bonilla has prefaced the volume with a biographical study (pp. 1-90) in which he presents a worthy treatment of the life, aims, method and work of Menéndez Pelayo,—a treatment based on an intimate acquaintance with both the man and his writings. Among the interesting biographical items may be mentioned the list of studies on Menéndez Pelayo himself (pp. 93-5); a plan of the unwritten volumes of the *Ideas estéticas* (pp. 47-49); reference to the unpublished correspondence between Milá and Ferdinand Wolf (p. 50); the fees received for various publications (p. 56); terms of the bequest of his library to the city of Santander (pp. 58-60). Finally, we have a descriptive and analytical bibliography (pp. 91-148) which is the culmination of several previous studies on the same subject and which may be regarded as final. An excellent portrait forms the frontispiece of the volume.

---

In his *Syntax der Modi im modernen Französisch* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1914, 266 pp.), Hermann Soltmann has collected material from contemporary sources and has grouped it according to kinship in thought categories rather than after the traditional schemes. Drawing upon works of the most unequal value, including authors notoriously careless of style, fad-dists, and no little trivial or ephemeral literature, the book is not one to be placed as a guide in the hands of the learner, but to the syntactical *piocheur* it is a delight. The author, whose eye is keen and whose reading is as extensive as it is catholic—or shall we say heretical—, has dug out a number of rare and interesting specimens among which hardly a reader but can find curiosities that will fill long vacant spots in his cabinet. The book is not speech history, but an interesting compilation of the kind of material from which speech history is made, for out of it and its like are culled those bits which, attaining a permanent hold, keep even the official syntax of a language from ever becoming a completed story.